

Concordia

Theological Monthly

Vol. XII

FEBRUARY, 1941

No. 2

Faith

As the term "faith" holds a rather prominent place in the language of the Church, it may be well to examine more closely its meaning and implications.

The Greek word for "faith" is πίστις, *pistis*. It is derived from the word πείθω, *peitho*, which means to persuade, to convince, and it designates the state of being persuaded or convinced. Such conviction may, in the first place, be merely intellectual; a person is convinced of in his own mind and accepts as true what he has learned. But ordinarily the word *pistis* implies more; it includes the effect such conviction has on the heart, namely, assurance, confidence, and trust. Therefore the word πιστεύω, *pisteuo*, means to put one's trust and confidence in some one or something. Also in the English language we distinguish between "belief" and "faith." Belief, as a rule, suggests little more than intellectual assent; we believe what a person tells us, we accept it as true. Faith, however, implies trust and confidence, as one in whom persuasion and belief has ripened into faith not only believes what he has heard, but he believes *in* it, he trusts in it, relies on it.

As used in the Bible, the word "faith" does not always carry the full implications of the term; hence the exact concept in a given text must be learned from the context. Thus we read in Gal. 1:2,3 that Paul preached the "faith" he once destroyed. While opinions differ, our view is that this is not the faith of the heart by which men believe, *fides, qua creditur*, but rather the doctrines they believe, *fides, quae creditur*. But when Jesus praised the faith of the woman of Canaan, Matt. 15:28, He spoke of the faith that was in her heart.

But even when used of this personal faith, the word has not always the same import. In Rom. 3:3 Paul speaks of the "faith" of God, which is God's faithfulness to do what He has promised. And Rom. 14:23 we read: "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

Here faith is contrasted with doubt and merely signifies the personal conviction one may have as to what is morally right or wrong. In a similar way a person may accept as true what the Bible teaches, but this faith may neither touch his heart nor be reflected in his life, Jas. 2:17-19. But the faith of the woman in Matt. 9:21 definitely was trust and confidence.

But even when the word "faith" is used in the sense of trusting confidence, there may be a difference as to the object of this trust. In 2 Cor. 1:9 the verb *peitho*, from which *pistis* is derived, is used. And here we learn that we should not trust, believe, in ourselves, but in God. There is no difference as far as the act of believing and trusting is concerned; the human attitude of trust, confidence, and faith is the same whether we trust in ourselves or in God. The difference lies in the object of our trust. In the one case we trust in ourselves, our strength and our wisdom; in the other case we rely on God.

We may make still another distinction if we consider the purpose for which we trust in God or what we hope for from God. We do not wish to question that the centurion, Luke 7:1-10, trusted in Jesus also for spiritual blessings for himself; yet the story as recorded shows that he trusted in Christ for physical help for his servant. But when Paul told the jailer at Philippi to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, Acts 16:31, then he meant that this man was to trust in Christ for the salvation of his soul. It is of this faith in Christ for the remission of sins that Paul speaks Rom. 3:25: "Whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation through faith in His blood," and v. 28: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the Law."

Thus it appears that the word "faith" as used in the Bible has not always the same meaning, nor does it always attach itself to the same object.

I

An authoritative definition of faith we have Heb. 11:1: "Now, faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." The omission of the article before *pistis* shows that the word does not refer to any specific faith, such as faith in God or faith in the merits of Christ, but that it must be taken in its abstract conception. Without referring to any particular object of faith, it tells us what faith, any kind of faith, is.

Faith cannot and does not exist for and by itself but must always be conceived of as in relation to some object; there can be no faith in the heart if there is not something to which this faith clings. The object of faith, or the things with which faith is concerned, is in our text described as *ἐλπιζόμενων*, "things hoped for," and as *πραγμάτων οὐ βλεπομένων*, "things not seen," things therefore that do not fall under the cognizance of the senses,

whether they be past, present, or future. Thereby the sphere of faith is sharply distinguished and separated from the realm of immediate knowledge and of science. Things which we can observe, experience, and demonstrate we do not believe, but we *know* them. Things, however, which lie beyond the reach of our senses and understanding, things for which we have no direct evidence and tangible proof, such things we *believe*. Faith itself is indeed a matter of personal experience—I know *that* I believe; but *what* I believe is a thing unseen and lies outside of my actual experience. Thus, generally speaking, our senses connect us with “things seen,” and our faith links up with “things not seen.”

This is illustrated in v. 3 of our chapter. “Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.” This world in which we live and the things therein can be “seen,” and are therefore the legitimate objects of our investigation and knowledge and, hence, the proper sphere of science. But the most painstaking scientific research will never reveal and demonstrate how all these things originally came into being, neither was there an eye-witness present at the beginning to record how it all happened. The creation of the world *ex nihilo*, by the power of God’s word, is a “thing not seen” and must therefore be accepted in faith on the basis of God’s revelation.

Again, the facts of Christ’s life, that He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, were witnessed by the disciples and many others, Acts 1:21, 22. But the meaning, the purpose, and the blessed results of His life and death no one could know from personal observation. These were things “not seen,” but they are revealed in the Scriptures and by the words of Christ and had to be accepted in faith. Thus the knowledge of the disciples was concerned with things they had seen; their faith, with things not seen.

Speaking, therefore, of the blessed truths of the Gospel, Paul writes: “Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit,” 1 Cor. 2:9, 10. The divine truths of the Gospel lie entirely outside of the reach of human observation, experience, and reasoning; we have no other evidence for them than the revelation of our God; hence there is no other way for us to receive them than by faith. It is for this reason that Paul says: “We walk by faith and not by sight,” 2 Cor. 5:7; and again: “We are saved by hope; but hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope? But if we hope for that we see not, then we do with patience wait for it,” Rom. 8:24, 25.

That belief and faith deal with matters which are not cognizable by our senses is apparent also in other relations. We believe many things which we have not witnessed ourselves but which were reported to us on good authority. We trust in a friend that he will stand by us in need although his help is as yet not evident. All our hopes are concerned with things that have not yet materialized. Faith, therefore, plays an important role in our daily lives; we believe much more and know much less than we ordinarily think.

The fact that faith is concerned with things of which we have no immediate knowledge does not mean that there could be faith without knowledge. We certainly must know of these things, and we do learn to know of them by way of information and revelation.

But what is the *essence* of faith? We read: "Faith is the substance (*ὑπόστασις*, *hypostasis*) of things hoped for, the evidence (*ἐλεγχος*, *elenchos*) of things not seen." These words present some difficulty to our understanding. Substance is the literal translation of *hypostasis*. But what can this mean in our text? According to Webster, substance is that "which underlies all outward manifestation; real, unchanging essence and nature; that in which qualities and accidents inhere; that which constitutes anything what it is." None of these meanings fits our text. For, if substance is that which constitutes what a thing is, its real essence, then the meaning of our text would be that faith constitutes that which the things hoped for really are; in other words, the things hoped for consist in faith, which would not make sense. The things we hope for differ from one another in their essence, nature, and character, and it is inconceivable that faith should be the underlying substance of them all. Furthermore, the things we hope for lie in the future; but faith is something we have in the present, and it is impossible that the faith I now have should constitute the substance of those future things I hope for. Nor can faith "give substance" to them, as suggested in a marginal reading. For this would mean that these things lack substance and reality without our faith. We believe in the forgiveness of sins and the life everlasting; yet it is not our faith that gives substance to these things, but God, who has promised them. Even if a person believes in his own imaginations, it is not his faith that makes them what they are, but it is his mind that creates these mental images and conceptions, and no faith can give substance to these idle dreamings.

The word *elenchos* means proof, evidence. But faith is not "the evidence of things not seen" in the sense that it proves their reality and existence. We cannot prove things unseen by the mere fact that we believe them. That God made the worlds out of nothing is a fact, and the faith of man does not prove this fact, nor does his unbelief disprove it.

What, then, do these words mean? The things we Christians hope for on the basis of God's promises are real and substantial enough in themselves, but they lie in the future, they have not yet appeared, 1 John 3:2; as far as our personal experience is concerned, they have not yet materialized. To faith, however, they are not wishful dreams and illusive possibilities but certainties and substantial facts. Faith reaches out into the future, apprehends these things, owns them, and makes us feel as sure of them as though we had actually experienced them. To illustrate: If I believe the promise of my friend that he will give me \$5 next week, then I am as sure of the money as though I had it substantially in my hand. The word "substance" in our text stands for the effect the possession of the substance has on me; for if I have the substance of a thing, then I am sure that I have it. Hence, faith is that attitude of the heart which is as sure of the things we hope and wait for as though they had already materialized and as though we possessed them even now. The Revised Version, therefore, translates: "Faith is the assurance of things hoped for."

However, the things we *hope for* mean something to us personally; we have an interest in them, we desire them with the expectation of obtaining them. Assurance, therefore, with respect to such things carries with it the connotation of trust and confidence; we feel positively sure that we shall have them. Hence we may define faith as an assured confidence, or a confident assurance. For the believer not only feels sure that the things he hopes for exist, but he also confidently trusts that he shall receive them. Luther has caught the full meaning of our text: "Es ist aber der Glaube eine gewisse Zuversicht des, das man hoffet."

The second part of our text reads: "The evidence of things not seen." M. H. Vincent (*Word Studies*) pertinently remarks: "*Hypostasis* and *elenchos* are not two and independent conceptions, in which case *kai* would have been added, but they stand in apposition. *Elenchos* is really included in *hypostasis*, but adds to the simple idea of assurance a suggestion of influences operating to produce conviction which carry the force of demonstration." Faith does not prove the unseen things to be real and true, but rather the unseen things prove themselves real and true to us; they dispel all doubt from the mind and convince the heart; and this conviction is faith. In the phrase "evidence of things not seen" we have again a metonymy. Evidence produces conviction; the cause, "evidence," is named, and the effect, "conviction," is meant. Although we do not see these things, we are as thoroughly convinced of them as though we had seen them with our very eyes, "as seeing Him who is invisible," v. 27. This conviction is

not based on the evidence of our senses nor on arguments of our reason nor any other extraneous proof, but the power to convince lies in these unseen things themselves; they prove themselves to be true. Faith, therefore, is not a mere wish, an assumption, a day-dream, still subject to doubt and misgivings, but it is a firm conviction that excludes all doubt; "nicht zweifeln an dem, das man nicht siehet." (Luther.)

This, however, does not mean that a believer may not at times be troubled with doubts and misgivings as to the things in which he trusts. One of the reasons for such doubts is the very fact that the things in which he believes are invisible to him. However, in no wise do such doubts stem from faith; they are the very opposite of faith, and where they dominate, they will ultimately destroy it. Faith never doubts, and whatever there is of it in the heart, it is always "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," always the *fiducia cordis* concerning such things as do not fall under the cognizance of our senses.

This faith must not be conceived of as a quiescent and passive condition of the heart but rather as an act of man, *fides actualis*. Indeed, it is not a physical act, like walking and running, nor a mere mental act, like thinking and reasoning, but it is an act of the heart, an emotional act; it belongs in the same category of psychic acts as loving or hating, respecting or despising, trusting or distrusting, some one. Love and hate, respect and contempt, trust and distrust, are indeed feelings, emotional attitudes; but since they are directed towards an object, they are not purely passive conditions but acts, sustained acts, that may continue for a long time. Also faith is an act of the heart. It is man that *does* the believing; his psychic powers of mind, heart, and will are engaged in this act. And he believes in *something*; his faith necessarily requires an object to which it clings. Faith, therefore, must be an act of the believer with respect to this object, an act by which he establishes and maintains a definite relation between himself and the things in which he believes. By faith he lays hold of these things, appropriates them to himself, trusts in them. And as faith is not a momentary act, which ceases as soon as it has established contact with its object but one that may continue for a long time, it might be called an active emotional attitude, even as the love we have for a person is a continued active attitude of the heart.

In this connection the words of Dr. Pieper (*Christliche Dogmatik*, Vol. II, p. 517) are pertinent. Speaking of saving faith, he says: "Weil der Glaube, insofern er in den Besitz der Vergebung bringt, die Verheissung des Evangeliums zum Objekt hat, so ist

er stets *fides actualis*, das heisst, *Akt* des Ergreifens, *actus apprehendendi*, und zwar nicht nur bei den Erwachsenen, sondern auch bei den Kindern. Alle, welche den rechtfertigenden Glauben im Gegensatz zum *Akt* des Ergreifens als eine im Herzen ruhende Potenz oder Beschaffenheit fassen, denken sich einen Glauben, der von seinem rechtfertigenden Objekt, der Verheissung des Evangeliums, *getrennt* ist, und sie schreiben daher dem Glauben *an sich*, dem Glauben als Werk oder guter Beschaffenheit, die Rechtfertigung zu."

The fact that the psychic powers of man, his mind, his heart, and his will, are engaged in the act of believing does not prove that he can by his own effort create faith. These powers are, as it were, merely instruments that are set in motion by some outside influence and power. No man can by a mere act of his will create in his heart a genuine desire for anything, but he desires it because it appears desirable to him, and it is this desirability that creates the desire. Neither can any one simply make up his mind to have implicit trust and confidence in a man; but it is the integrity and trustworthiness he discovers in that person which creates in his own heart trust and confidence. Thus it is here. In the "things hoped for" there must be something that makes them desirable to the believer, and there must also be something, as a reliable promise, that assures him that he shall have them. And these two elements create in the heart that assured confidence which we call faith. Faith in "things hoped for" is therefore the psychic reaction of man to the powerful action and influence of the promise of these things on the heart. While the promise of "things hoped for" and the offer of "things not seen" call for faith on the part of man, they also exert that power which creates this faith. In no case is faith the product of powers that lie within man, but it is always superinduced by powers and influences that lie outside of man, which powers, however, do not work mechanically but operate through and on the psychic endowments of man, his mind, heart, and will.

These general remarks on faith hold good for every special faith, whether this be faith in man or in an idol or in a saint or in one's own wisdom and imaginations. There is a great variety of objects to which faith may cling and in which it trusts, but in every case they are "things unseen" or "things hoped for"; in every case faith is an assured confidence on the part of man; in every case it is a psychic act of man called forth by the influence these things exert upon his mind, heart, and will. Thus the religious heathen may have a real and genuine confidence in his idol, the devout Romanist in his saint or in the amulet he wears around his neck; or one may put his confidence in man, Ps. 118:8.

In every case there is a *fiducia cordis*, which *per se* does not differ from the *fiducia cordis* of a Christian in the saving merits of Christ. The psychic act of trusting and believing is the same, but the difference lies in the things in which one trusts. Speaking of the heathen, Luther writes: "In the mind of the heathen to have a god means to trust and believe. But their error is this, that their trust is false and wrong; for it is not placed in the only God, besides whom there is truly no God in heaven or upon earth. Therefore the heathen really make their self-invented notions and dreams of God an idol and put their trust in that which is altogether nothing." (L. Cat., I, Com., 18. *Trigl.*, p. 585.) Thus there may be a real and genuine trust, confidence, faith, in the heart of a heathen; but it is false and vain because it is placed on that which is naught. This we learn also from the words of Paul. "If Christ be not raised, *your faith is vain*; ye are yet in your sins," 1 Cor. 15:17. To what does the word "vain" refer? Does it refer to the intrinsic constitution of faith as *fiducia cordis* or to its object? Evidently Paul does not mean to say that in this case their faith, considered purely as an act of their hearts, was of a wrong kind and caliber and that they would have to have a different type of faith. But he says that, if Christ be not raised, then He did not redeem them, then there is no remission of sins, and that in this case their faith is vain, empty, because it is placed on something that does not exist. In this case Paul uses the word "faith" in its full meaning as *fiducia cordis* with reference to an object which, hypothetically, is without reality. Thus faith as "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen" is not something specifically Christian; it may be found also in people that do not believe in the Gospel of Christ. And it is possible that a religious heathen has a stronger faith in his idol than a Christian has in his Savior. The difference lies not in the essence of the act of faith but in the object to which this faith clings.

II

What is the *object of Christian faith*? and more specifically, What is the object of saving faith? Generally speaking, the entire Bible is the object of our belief. For, given by inspiration of God, its every statement is divinely true, John 17:17, and must therefore be believed and accepted as true. This does not mean that one must know everything the Bible teaches in order to be saved; for not every truth of the Bible is a saving truth. The Law is indeed the true Word of God, but it cannot save us. Its commandments require obedience on our part; but there is nothing in them in which we could place our trust and confidence. A person may possibly trust for acceptance with God in

his own obedience to the Law, as the Pharisees did; but also in this case his faith is not in the Law. The record of the creation of the world, Gen. 1, is a divine truth, but the fact that one accepts and believes this record to be true will not save his soul, because this story does not tell us anything of our salvation; there is nothing in the narrative on which we might place our trust and confidence. When, therefore, Heb. 11:3 the word "faith" is used with reference to the creation, the term is not used in the full sense of *fiducia cordis* but rather in the sense of "assent," whereby we, on the authority of God's Word, agree to, and accept as true, what He reveals to us on this point. The Bible teaches that there is a Triune God. This we must accept and believe as true. However, even this is in itself not a saving truth, for the devils also believe this and tremble, Jas. 2:19; their belief that there is a God is not a faith in this sense, that they also put their trust in Him. We believe the doctrines of the First Article, we also trust in God that He will preserve and keep, guard and protect us, and provide us with all we need for this body and life. Now, here we have real trust and confidence, real faith. And still, this is not *saving* faith; for the things we believe according to this article do not pertain to the salvation of our soul. The fact, therefore, that a person with all his heart believes certain parts and doctrines of the Bible, that he trusts in God for temporal blessings, does not necessarily mean that he has saving faith.

What, then, is the object of saving faith? When Christ entered upon His public ministry, He said: "Repent ye and believe the Gospel," Matt. 1:15. The Gospel is called "the Gospel of your salvation," Eph. 1:13; Rom. 1:16. And Heb. 4:2 we read that the Gospel will not profit any one if it is not "mixed with faith" in them that hear it. Hence, saving faith rests on the Gospel, which is the glad tidings of the grace of God in Christ Jesus. The Gospel is not merely a biography of Jesus of Nazareth, telling us of His person, life, and death; it is not a bare record of historical facts witnessed by men of His day; but it speaks of "things not seen," of things that lie behind these historical facts and of which we could have no knowledge if they had not been revealed to us, 1 Cor. 2:7-10. It tells us that in our place Christ fulfilled the Law, Gal. 4:4, 5, that He gave His life as a ransom for many, Matt. 20:28, that He is the Propitiation for our sins, 1 John 2:2, that by Him God reconciled the world to Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, 2 Cor. 5:19. The historical facts of the Gospel are briefly summarized in the Second Article of the Creed; but the Gospel *meaning* of these facts Luther has beautifully expressed in the explanation of this article. This Gospel, then, is the object to

which saving faith clings, because it proclaims the grace of God to lost sinners and offers them the merits of Christ's redemption.

Again we read: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house," Acts 16:31. This does not mean that besides believing in the Gospel we must also believe in Christ. The Gospel is "the Gospel of Christ" not only because it was He who taught it, Luke 4:18, but especially because it treats of Him, reveals Him to us as our Savior, and offers to us those blessings, forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation, which He has procured for us, Rom. 1:16, 17. Christ is the content of the Gospel, and the twain cannot be separated. Without Christ there would be no Gospel, and without the Gospel we could not know anything of Christ and His salvation. Whoever preaches the Gospel must preach Christ, and whoever preaches Christ as the Savior of men preaches the Gospel. And he who believes in the promises of the Gospel also believes in Christ, and whoever would believe in Christ must believe in the promises of His Gospel. The object of our faith, then, is Christ as He is revealed to us in the Gospel.

And still, not every so-called faith in Christ is a saving faith. He who regards Jesus merely as a good man, a great teacher, an exemplar of a righteous life, and trusts in Him as a safe guide, following whose footsteps he shall attain eternal life, does not really believe in the Gospel and has no saving faith. Neither has he who merely believes that Christ is true God and man. 'Tis true, saving faith includes the latter, for Christ could not have accomplished the work of our redemption if He had not been God and man. Still, saving faith does not center in the person of Jesus Christ, but rather in His work for us. To be saved, we must trust in Him as the *Savior of sinners* and, more especially, as *our* Savior. He who believes in a general way that Christ is the Savior of sinners but does not include himself among those whom He has redeemed has no saving faith. Saving faith is a very personal matter also in this, that one applies to himself personally the promises of God's grace in the Gospel. Paul confessed himself to be the chief of sinners; yet he was sure that also he had obtained mercy, 1 Tim. 1:15. Even so I must believe "that Jesus Christ, true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the Virgin Mary, is my Lord, who has redeemed *me*, a lost and condemned creature, purchased and won *me* from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil, not with gold or silver, but with His holy, precious blood and with His innocent suffering and death, that I may be His own, and live under Him in His kingdom, and serve Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness, even as He is risen from the dead, lives and reigns to all eternity. This is most certainly true." This

is the best summary of the Gospel ever penned by human hands, and this, in brief, constitutes the object of saving faith. Still more briefly stated, saving faith is the assurance and confidence of the heart that "the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanseth us from all sin," 1 John 1:7.

A person may know and believe everything else in the Bible, he may even trust in God and Christ for all manner of other blessings, if he does not accept Christ as his personal Savior and does not trust in Him for the forgiveness of his sins, he cannot be saved. On the other hand, it is possible that a person is ignorant of other truths revealed in the Bible—as is the case with our little children—or that he misunderstands and misinterprets certain texts and thus believes a false doctrine—as many in heterodox churches do—; still, if he sincerely believes that in Christ he has the redemption through faith in His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of God's grace, Eph. 1:7, he will certainly be saved. For saving faith can exist in the heart when from *ignorance* a person errs in some other doctrine of the Bible; but there can be no saving faith when he is ignorant of, or errs with respect to, the cardinal truth of the Gospel. Nor can there be true faith in the Gospel if he wilfully rejects any other Bible doctrine which he has learned to be true. He who trusts for his salvation in anything else than the merits of the Savior Jesus Christ cannot be saved, no matter how sincere his faith otherwise may be. For the object of saving faith is not anything "hoped for," not anything "not seen," but solely this one thing, the forgiveness of sins procured for us by Christ and offered to us in the Gospel.

This answers also the question, Why does faith save? It is not the human act of believing, trusting in, and relying upon, Christ that saves. The performance of the act of faith has no saving power. Faith does not justify us before God because of its ethical value as a good work; for on the part of man faith is only the means by which he lays hold of, applies, and appropriates to himself, what the Gospel offers. The saving power lies in the merits of Christ's redemption and in the absolution of God based on these merits, Eph. 1:7. The saving power of these merits is, furthermore, not affected by the weakness or the strength of faith in man. Both the weak and the strong in faith trust in the same Savior, and both have the full forgiveness of their sins. While, therefore, we must stress the necessity of faith and maintain that a man is justified by faith alone, without the deeds of the Law, Rom. 3:28, let us be careful that we do not make of faith a saving work. Not faith but Christ is our Savior, and the function of faith is only instrumental, inasmuch as thereby we lay hold of Christ and His salvation.

III

Faith is sometimes defined as knowledge of, assent to, and confidence in, the promises of God's grace. This is correct, but it must also be correctly understood.

Knowledge is a prerequisite of faith. There can be no "substance of things hoped for" if one is totally ignorant of these things. The *fides carbonaria*, according to which a person is supposed to believe and trust in things of which he has no knowledge, is an impossibility. For how can one hope for things if he does not even know what these things are? There must be thoughts, ideas, knowledge, in the mind before there can be faith in the heart. Indeed, this is not a direct knowledge, such as comes by personal observation or experience, but one that comes by hearing and information or sometimes also by mere imagination. Whatever its origin, knowledge of the things in which we trust is the basis of such trust. What Paul writes Rom. 10:14: "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard," is true of every kind of faith. The faith of the heart is rooted in the knowledge of the mind, and where there is no knowledge, there can be no faith.

Because of this fact it is necessary that we instruct our people, we must impart knowledge of the Gospel truths if they are to have faith in their hearts. And such instruction must be clear and definite in order that they who hear us may have clear and definite ideas concerning the things that pertain to their salvation. A preacher or a teacher who is not clear in his own mind cannot impart clear knowledge to those who hear him; and a hearer that is confused as to what he is to believe cannot believe. It is through the mind that we reach the heart; hence it must be our concern that we fill the mind with very definite ideas and a clear understanding. The fact that some who hear do not come to faith is sometimes due to poor teaching; they listen to a sermon but do not grasp what it is all about. We who teach must constantly watch ourselves on this point. The fault that a sermon does not strike home lies not always with the hearer; sometimes it lies with the preacher. It is not sufficient that the matter he wishes to present be perfectly clear to him; he must make it clear to his congregation. And it is a grievous charge when people say that they do not get anything out of our sermon because the entire presentation was confused and there was little they could remember to meditate on during the week. Let us preach thoughts and ideas, not big words and high-sounding phrases, and let us present these thoughts in language so clear that also the less educated of our hearers can understand what we mean. For unless we impart to our hearers a clear, definite knowledge of the Gospel truths, it is impossible for them to believe.

But while we must know what we are to believe, we do not believe all we know. We do not believe all we hear people say nor all we read in books. We remember some of Grimm's *Maerchen*, we learned of the twelve "labors" of Hercules, we are acquainted with some of the legends of Romish saints; yet we believe none of these, much less do we believe in any of them. It is therefore evident that an intellectual knowledge of things with which faith may be concerned is in itself not faith. "Faith is not only knowledge in the intellect." (Apol. *Trigl.*, p. 205.)

Assent to what we know is a prerequisite of faith. No one believes or trusts in things which he doubts or knows to be false. Before we place our confidence in anything, we must regard it as reliable and true. Thus the heathen trusts in his idol because he accepts as true what he has learned of him; the Romanist looks for help to his saint because he regards as true what his priest has told him of this saint; the superstitious person believes in his imaginations because he does not regard them as imaginations but as truths. Thus it is possible that a person has genuine trust and confidence of heart in things which in themselves are foolish and false; still there can be no such trust and confidence as long as a person *regards* them as foolish and false. There can be no faith without acceptance of the truth in question.

While people sometimes believe in things which are but subjectively true, *i. e.*, true only to those who believe them to be so, the doctrines of the Gospel are objectively true, irrespective of what men think about them. "Thy Word is truth," John 17:17. But if our hearers are to accept them as God's truths, we must also present them as such, 1 Tim. 2:13. If the preacher casts doubt on any statement of the Bible or but faintly intimates that he does not accept it as true, he will thereby at once prejudice his hearers against this and any other statement of the Bible. They will not regard as true, and therefore not believe, what the Bible says. We must also beware of mixing all manner of personal opinions into our sermons, to which our hearers may rightfully take exception. For not discriminating between the word of man and the Word of God, it is possible that they will discredit the truth of God together with our personal views. Neither should we present the Gospel truths in an academic, theoretical way, without impressing upon our hearers the truth of what we are saying. Paul repeatedly told his readers that he spoke the truth in Christ, Rom. 9:1; 1 Tim. 2:7. Even though we do not say it in so many words, our entire presentation of Bible truths must pulsate with personal conviction. We must ourselves be convinced if we would convince others. Indeed, we cannot add to the convincing power of God's

Word, but let us beware of hindering it. If our people are to trust in the promises of God, they must be convinced of their truth.

While such assent to the truths of God is necessary for faith, it by itself is not faith. There are many things which we have learned from books, things which we accept and believe to be true; yet we do not believe *in* them in the sense that we also trust in them, because there is nothing in them that calls for trust and confidence on our part. There is belief, but there is no faith, although the belief is sometimes called a "historic faith." In like manner one may believe "that there is a God," Jas. 2:19, that is, accept this fact as true, and still not believe *in* God, that is, not put trust and confidence in God. On the contrary, such a person's heart may be full of fear and hatred; and he may tremble at the very thought of God. The devil, no doubt, knows the promises of the Gospel, he is convinced that they are true; but he cannot have faith in them because they are not intended for him. Thus it is possible that a man has a fair knowledge of the system of Christian doctrines and for philosophic reasons accepts it as true, and still it may be only an intellectual assent; the truths of the Gospel may mean nothing to him personally; his heart may not be touched, he may have no faith.

It is apparent that, while knowledge and assent are necessary prerequisites to faith, they in themselves do not constitute the essence of faith. It is true that the word "knowledge," John 17:3, is used as a synonym of faith, but in this case the word includes more than bare knowledge; it includes the effect this knowledge has on the heart.

The essence of faith is confidence of the heart. "Faith is the substance of things hoped for." The words "hoped for" indicate that on the part of the believer there is a personal interest in, and desire for, these things, that he has set his heart on them and wishes to have them for himself. And the word "substance" shows that these hoped-for things are as sure to the believer as though he actually had them. Now such assurance of things we hope for is confidence, reliance, trust. This certainty and assurance, this trust and confidence, this *fiducia cordis*, constitutes the real essence of faith.

Thus the faith of a religious heathen does not consist merely in this, that he knows, and regards as true, what he has learned of his idol, but that he looks to, and depends on, his idol for help and protection, for blessings and comfort. The faith of a devout Romanist in his patron saint does not consist merely in knowledge of, and assent to, what he has learned of this saint, but he trusts in him for help. It is true, their faith is vain because it is based on what is naught; nevertheless, as far as their attitude is concerned, there is real trust and confidence.

Let us take examples from the Scriptures. The centurion of Capernaum, Luke 7:1-10; the nobleman, John 4:47-53; the woman of Canaan, Matt. 15:21-28, they, like many others, had heard of this Jesus of Nazareth, who was going about and "healing them that were in need of healing." But in their case there was something more than bare knowledge and conviction of this fact; there was in their hearts a confident hope that Jesus would help them also in their troubles. And it was this that prompted them to go to Him. This help had not yet materialized, it was to them a thing "hoped for," a thing "not seen"; still they were sure of it in their hearts. This assurance and confidence, which reached out for, and held to, this hoped-for help is the very essence of faith. "Weil der Glaube, insofern er selig macht, nur das Evangelium, das um Christi willen Vergebung der Suenden zusagt, zum Objekt hat, so ist der Glaube seinem Wesen nach (*formaliter*) *Vertrauen des Herzens* (*fiducia cordis*) auf die im Evangelium dargebotene Gnade. Dies kommt auch zum Ausdruck durch die Redeweise πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν υἱόν, Joh. 3:16, 18, 38; πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν, Gal. 2:16. Solange jemand von Christo nur Notiz nimmt (*notitia historica*) und die Kunde von ihm fuer historisch wahr haelt (*assensus historicus*), ohne auf Christum seines Herzens Zuversicht zu setzen, ist weder das Ganze noch ein Teil des Glaubens vorhanden, insofern er rechtfertigt und selig macht." (Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, Vol. II, p. 508.)

When, therefore, we define faith as knowledge, assent, and confidence, it is well to bear in mind that, while these three are necessary, they are not identical nor is any one of them a third part of faith. There may be knowledge without assent, there may be assent without confidence, but there can be no confidence without knowledge and assent.

IV

We differentiate between cause and effect but know that there is a close connection and intimate relation between the two. In like manner we must distinguish between knowledge and faith but at the same time recognize their causal nexus.

By teaching and information we instil thoughts and ideas into the mind of a person, and thus he acquires knowledge. But this knowledge possesses potential power to impress and move the heart. Whenever it does so, an emotion or emotional attitude results, which is one's personal reaction to what one has learned and indicates how one feels about these things. Thus, when Absalom spoke evil of his father, his slanderous remarks finally created distrust of David in the hearts of the people. On the other hand, when Jonathan spoke well of David, his words had a quite

different effect on Saul. In every case the attitude of our heart is the effect and product of the thoughts in our mind. It is even so with faith. There is a man depressed in his spirit because of his sins, his heart is full of fear and despair, yea, even hatred of God, and there is nothing in him or in his experience that could change this attitude. But now the Gospel is preached to him; God Himself tells him: "Be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee," Matt. 9:2. If these words touch his heart, fear and despair will vanish like the mist before the rising sun, and there springs up in his heart joy and hope and confidence. Thus faith is not bare intellectual knowledge of spiritual truths, but it is rather the effect this knowledge has on the heart.

And this is exactly what Paul teaches. He calls the Gospel a power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, Rom. 1:16. This does not mean, as superstitious people sometimes think, that an external contact with the Gospel will be of any benefit. We must hear, learn, and thus know the promises of God. "So, then, faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word of God," Rom. 10:17. Neither the printed nor the preached Gospel will work faith in our hearts unless by reading and hearing we obtain knowledge of its promises. And when this knowledge touches and moves the heart, faith results. The Gospel, then, is the means by which God makes known to man the offer of His grace; hearing this Gospel is the means by which man learns to know of this offer; knowledge of this Gospel is the means by which God works on the heart to create faith. Hence we may say, Faith comes by knowledge, and knowledge comes by the Word of God.

Indeed, "faith is of the operation of God," Col. 2:12. But faith is not the product of an immediate action of God; for He operates through the Word. "Which believe on Me through their word," John 17:20. Man is not a block or a stone but a rational being that can be taught and impressed. Also in conversion God deals with man as with a rational being. Having Himself endowed him with a mind that can learn and acquire knowledge, with a heart that can be impressed and moved, with a will that can be turned and directed by these thought-controlled emotions, He makes use of this psychic equipment when by His Gospel He works faith in the heart of man.

The fact that in the act of believing these faculties are engaged does not mean that of themselves they could create faith or that man could "by his own reason or strength believe in Christ, or come to Him"; for theirs is not a creative but a functional power, which must be set in motion by some stimulus, influence, or power other than themselves. Without this the psychic equipment of man is like a machine where the power to start, drive,

and direct it are lacking. To be sure, there are external and internal stimuli, and some of them running at cross purposes. There is also a certain interaction between the mind, the heart, and the will. But in its simplest form the psychological process is about like this: Through our senses we come in contact with things about us; as we apperceive these things in our minds, we acquire knowledge; this knowledge has the power to impress and move the heart; these emotions then turn and direct the will.

In conversion the Holy Ghost makes use of this psychic equipment of man and follows this psychic process. The *modus operandi* is as follows: The Gospel is the external stimulus, which man must hear and learn. Thus he acquires knowledge of the promise of grace. Through this knowledge the Holy Ghost exerts an influence on the heart, creating therein an emotion, dispelling fear and instilling trust and confidence, which at once turns the will of man toward God. The moment knowledge has effectually worked on the heart, conversion results. Therefore the Word of God and man's knowledge of this Word are the means by, with, and through which the Holy Ghost operates on the heart to create faith. "Preaching and hearing of God's Word are the instruments of the Holy Ghost by, with, and through which He desires to work efficaciously and to convert men to God and to work in them both to will and to do." (F. C., Th. D., *Trigl.*, p. 901.)

Yet not every word of God will produce faith. As each letter type makes its own distinct impression on the paper, so each thought or thought group has its own emotional effect on the heart. The heart feels as the mind thinks, and the impression made is determined by the content of the thought. Hence we may not expect that anything we may teach from the Word of God will also work faith in them that hear us; but we must impart faith-producing knowledge. Here apply the words of Paul that we "rightly divide the Word of Truth," 2 Tim. 2:15. The Law and the Gospel are both the Word of God, yet their effects on the heart are quite different. No matter how well and impressively we may explain and teach the Law, its final emotional effect is fear and despair. The Gospel, on the other hand, with its promise of free grace and forgiveness of sins, can and, if it touches the heart, will create confidence, trust, and love.

A conscientious physician is very careful as to what remedy he prescribes for his patient. From the *materia medica* he will select that medicine which, according to his professional opinion, will have the desired effect. We likewise must be scrupulously careful as to what we teach our spiritual patients; for it is the content of our teaching that determines the impression and effect on their hearts and souls. If we teach a man a wrong doctrine, he

will not only have wrong ideas in his mind, but, if they touch his heart, there will also be a wrong emotional reaction, a wrong faith. We therefore insist on purity of Scripture doctrines not only because we stand in awe of God's Word, Is. 66:2, but also for the very practical reason that only the right doctrine can convey right thoughts to the mind and create the right faith in the heart.

Again, as faith is a matter of the heart, we must beware lest in our teaching we appeal exclusively to the intellect. We must indeed impart knowledge to the mind; yet our aim is and must be that through this knowledge we impress and move the heart. While it is God, operating through this Word, that opens the heart, Acts 16:14, we who teach this Word should not do so in a listless and apathetic fashion, without any concern on our part whether or not our hearers accept what we teach them. We are to preach the Gospel for the distinct purpose of winning men for Christ and of keeping them with Christ, Matt. 28:19. Of this purpose we must always be conscious, and such consciousness will then also be reflected in our manner of teaching. Being ourselves convinced, we shall try to convince others; being ourselves impressed with what we have learned, we shall speak impressively to those that hear us; having ourselves found peace and joy in Christ, we shall endeavor to bring this peace to the hearts of our hearers.

Faith comes by knowledge, but it also lives and thrives on knowledge. When knowledge ceases, faith dies. No one can continue in the faith of Christ if he has forgotten what the Gospel teaches concerning the Savior. As the plant is rooted in the soil, so faith is rooted in the knowledge of the Gospel and continually draws nourishment and strength therefrom. Hence it is necessary that the saving truths of God's Word be again and again called to our remembrance lest our faith die of starvation. This, however, does not mean that we have faith only while and as long as our mind is consciously occupied with God's promises of grace. We are not conscious of all we know, and still we know it; we love our friends even though we are not thinking of them. Even so it is with faith. Believers are in the faith also when they sleep or lie in a state of unconsciousness or while their thoughts are occupied with the duties of their calling. Nevertheless we should diligently hear the Word of God and often meditate upon its promises that our faith may continue and live; for the power of God that keeps us through faith unto salvation, 1 Pet. 1:5, operates through the Gospel, Rom. 1:16.

But the matter of fact is that not all who hear and know the Gospel come to faith, nor do they all continue in the faith that once was theirs. Responsibility for this lies in no sense with God, but entirely and exclusively with man. For "God will have all

men to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth," 1 Tim. 2:4. But Christ had to tell the children of Jerusalem, "Ye would not," Matt. 23:37, and Stephen said to the Jews, "Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost," Acts 7:51.

But how is it possible for men to resist God? When God acts in His uncovered majesty, as when He called the light out of darkness and when He will call the dead from their graves, there is nothing and no one that can resist and refuse. But when He acts through means, then man has the power to resist and check the working of His might. It is the almighty power of God that makes the plant grow, blossom, and bear fruit. Yet man can cut down the plant and thus resist and interrupt the normal working of God's power in this particular case. Likewise God operates through means when He would bring man to faith. He employs the Gospel as the external means through which He works on man, and He uses the psychic endowments of man, his mind, heart, and will, as the internal means on which and in which He would work faith. And here it is where man has that dreadful power to resist and to frustrate the gracious designs of God. The Gospel itself he cannot deprive of its efficacy, but when its power is brought to bear on him personally, he can hinder its effect on his heart.

If the mind and heart of man were absolutely void of all other thoughts and feelings, or if man could so thoroughly forget and suppress everything else as to become truly neutral in his attitude, then the knowledge of the Gospel would undoubtedly produce a favorable reaction in his heart; in other words, if there were no obstructions at all in the mind and heart of man, the power of the Gospel would inevitably work faith. But if the heart of man is possessed of, and dominated by, thoughts and inclinations that run contrary to the Gospel, then these will, and can do nothing but resist the influence of the Gospel.

To illustrate: Children, whose minds are relatively more free and open than the minds of grown people, will more readily believe, and are more easily impressed by, what we tell them than adults, who are settled in their convictions and attitudes. "Es ist schwer, alte Hunde baendig und alte Schaelke fromm zu machen; . . . aber die jungen Baeumlein kann man besser biegen und ziehen." (Luther.) Grown people have their own ideas, who critically examine, and perhaps regard as foolish, what we tell them. Or they may have developed certain attitudes of heart which are so contrary to the intended effect of our message that they counteract every influence our words might otherwise have. Again, we find that people are prejudiced or are so preoccupied with other matters that whatever we may say does not reach their

heart. In every such case it is a struggle of powers that actually possess and control the heart against powers that would *gain* possession and control of the heart.

Now, what is the power that controls the heart of natural man? What is his attitude toward God and His Word? Is there anything in his knowledge and experience that could possibly incline his heart toward God or induce him to assume a neutral position? Ever since the Fall the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth, Gen. 8:21; his thoughts, desires, and inclinations are toward evil. He is flesh born of flesh, John 3:6; therefore he is carnally minded, his mind is set on the things of the flesh, on things that are contrary to God's will; hence he is an enemy of God, Rom. 5:6, 7. He is wise in his own conceits, Rom. 12:16, selfish, self-righteous, and very much satisfied with himself. He sins, and he loves his sins, he is given to the joys and pleasures, the cares and worries, of life. And there is nothing in his natural make-up and in his daily experience that could possibly bring about a change in his attitude. Being, therefore, what he is, natural man can do nothing but resist the efforts of God to win him. Even Christians experience this hostility of their flesh. Paul says: "I am carnal, sold under sin. . . . I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing. . . . I see another law in my members, warring against the Law of my mind," Rom. 7:14, 18, 23. Even after regeneration our flesh does not in the least cooperate with the Spirit, or the new man in us, but "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things ye would," Gal. 5:17. If, then, even in a Christian the flesh is so antagonistic to the Spirit, may we assume that in an unconverted person it is less so? And all these inhibitions that tend to resist and counteract the influence of the Gospel originate in man. Whenever, therefore, he acts on his own, according to his own inclinations and will, then he cannot but resist the efforts of God.

But the fact that by his own impulse and strength he can and does resist does not prove that by his own impulse and strength he can also accept and believe the Gospel. By nature he is disposed to do the first, but there is nothing in his make-up that may enable and dispose him to do also the second. If by his own reason and strength he were to believe in Christ, he would first have to change his entire nature, which he cannot do and is not inclined to do. If, therefore, any man comes to faith, then this is not due to any natural movement or impetus, but solely and exclusively to influences that work on him from without, namely, the power of the Holy Ghost in the Gospel. Man remains what he is by his own will; but when there is a change, a *metanoia*, then this is wrought

by powers and influences not inherent in his nature. It is even so in the physical world. Things remain what they are by nature, and when a change is brought about, it is effected by powers other than those inherent in that particular thing. The liquid water can be changed into a solid block of ice; but it cannot do this of itself; it is the cold temperature that brings about this change. Thus man is capable of conversion, but he cannot convert himself; this God must do, and He does it through the Gospel. Making use of the psychic equipment of man, the Holy Ghost gives man a new knowledge, creates in him new movements and longings, turns his will toward God, and thus works faith. Faith, therefore, is the product of God's power operating through the Gospel.

In this connection a difficult question arises. If all men are by nature equally impotent to convert themselves or to contribute anything towards their conversion, and if God seriously wants to save all men and is the only one who can do so, why, then, are some converted and others not? If the same conditions prevail and the same power is applied, we should expect the same result: either all are converted or none. Why some and not others? We can answer these questions separately. If man is converted, then that is God's doing; if man is not converted, then that is man's doing. "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in Me is thy help," Hos. 13:9. But if we join these questions, we cannot give an answer that covers both. Calvinism has a uniform answer: God does not want to convert and save all men; which is wrong. Synergism also has a uniform answer: Those are converted who cooperate with God in bringing about their conversion, which is likewise wrong. We are here confronted with a difficulty which the Scriptures do not solve and which human reason should not try to solve.

When by the power of the Holy Ghost man has come to faith, a radical change is wrought in him both in his relation to God and in the conduct of his daily life. However, let us not assume that his sinful nature, his Old Adam, has been definitely killed, that his flesh is now changed into a saint. His flesh remains flesh, and his Old Adam remains what he was. But a new power has been created in his heart, his faith. Both his flesh and his faith coexist in his heart, each striving for the mastery, Gal. 5:17; Rom. 7:23. As long as we live in this mortal body, we shall have our "flesh," the Old Adam. Faith cannot kill the flesh, but the flesh can kill the faith. The flesh with its affections and lusts is a constant danger to our faith; it did not want faith to enter the heart, and it does not want faith to continue in the heart. We must therefore watch our hearts that we do not yield to the destructive influences of the flesh. It is because of this that we are told: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling," Phil. 2:12;

"with fear and trembling" because of the sinister and faith-destroying influence of our own flesh. On the other hand, we must continue to use the Word of God, by which faith was wrought and by which it is preserved. We must frequently meditate on the precious promises of the Gospel and examine ourselves whether we be in the faith, 2 Cor. 13:5. We have this treasure of faith in earthen vessels, 2 Cor. 4:7; hence let us pray: "Lord, increase our faith," Luke 17:5.*

River Forest, Ill.

E. W. A. KOEHLER

Luther's Spiritual Martyrdom and Its Appeasement

Luther had entered the monastery in order to merit eternal life and was convinced that the life of a monk was the surest way in which to obtain the grace of God. Now, the way in which Luther sought to gain salvation was according to the Catholic doctrine of justification, with this difference, that as a monk he had taken upon himself the heaviest yoke of Christ and that he had given himself exclusively into the service of God.

During the first two years in the monastery Luther's faith in his monkery seems to have remained unshaken, for during those earlier years there is no trace of an acute spiritual conflict. Luther did at times experience doubts and misgivings; but "burning up with zeal," his life as a whole was "quiet and peaceful." However, after Luther was ordained priest, and after he had begun the study of Catholic theology, there was a marked difference. Luther says of his monastic life: "Certain it is, I was a pious monk and observed the rules of my order so strictly that I venture to say that if a monk could have gained heaven through monkery, I should certainly have got there. This all my fellow-monks who have known me will attest." (Weimar ed., XXXVIII:143.) "I was so deeply plunged in monkery, even to delirium and insanity. If righteousness was to be gotten by the Law, I should certainly have attained it." (Vol. XL, Pt. I:134.) But Luther adds: "If it had lasted much longer, I should have martyred myself to death

* EDITORIAL NOTE.—Lest the author be misunderstood, we quote a few sentences from his own book, *A Summary of Christian Doctrine* (p. 126): "Knowledge is so essential to faith that sometimes faith is called knowledge outright. 'And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent,' John 17:3. However, the word 'knowledge' is here used in a fuller sense. It means not a purely intellectual knowledge, such as unbelievers may have, but it is a live knowledge, a *nosse cum affectu*, a knowledge which has affected the heart and the will, working conviction and confidence. While faith is based on, and sustained by, the knowledge of the mind, it is essentially a *fiducia cordis*, confidence of the heart, which confidence is an emotional attitude of the heart plus an act of the will. 'With the heart man believeth unto salvation,' Rom. 10:10."

with watching, praying, studying, and other performances." (Vol. XXXVII:143.) Time and again Luther refers to his experiences in the monastery as a "spiritual martyrdom."

But what were the "real difficulties" in Luther's monastic life? What was the real cause of Luther's spiritual conflict? It has been maintained that the cause of Luther's suffering was physical, that, owing to a neurotic condition, the result of intense asceticism, Luther was seized by an alarming fear and was more or less mentally deranged. (Hausrath.) Catholic theologians (Denifle, Grisar) and others have claimed that Luther's troubles were sexual and that he, like Augustine, was a slave of lust. But Luther himself says: "When I was a monk, I was not much troubled with sexual desires" (Tischreden, I:47), and that his confessions to Staupitz "were not concerned with women" (Tischreden, I:240). Luther's real difficulties were the question of God's righteousness, the problem of being justified through the Sacraments, and the subject of predestination. But what was the real cause of Luther's spiritual martyrdom? We answer: *The Doctrine of the Catholic Church*. It was the Catholic doctrine of justification combined with the Scotist doctrine of free will and grace; for if any conscience-stricken sinner seeks salvation according to these doctrines, he must suffer the torments of the damned. Luther's trouble was also aggravated by the "modern" conception of God as the absolute Free Will.

According to the Augustinian doctrine of justification, as taught by both Thomists and Scotists, the sinner is justified by means of grace infused by God either through or in conjunction with the Sacraments. In none of the Scholastics (except in Bernard of Clairvaux) do we find even an inkling or trace of the Scriptural doctrine of the objective reconciliation and justification. It is true, at that time, even as today, the Catholic Church spoke much of the suffering and death of Christ; however, at that time, religion centered on the thought that Christ will return to judge the quick and the dead. Only he who has that "grace which makes acceptable" can merit eternal life and stand in the Last Judgment and escape eternal damnation.

In order that he might stand in the Day of Judgment, Luther sought to love God above all things, and his attention was called to such "evangelical perfection" in the first paragraph of the "Rule of Augustine." Luther had vowed to "keep the whole Rule" (Vol. VIII:633). This meant that every infraction of the Rule was to be regarded as sin, and through the rigorous routine of the monastery Luther's conscience was sharpened to a razor's edge. Now, it is true, the Scholastics made a general distinction between mortal and venial sins; but it was never definitely decided con-

cerning every sin into which category it belonged. Besides, there was also a great difference of opinion among the monks as to which infraction of the Rule was to be regarded as a mortal and which was to be regarded as a venial sin.

According to Catholic doctrine Baptism pertains only to original sin and to the sins committed before Baptism, for after Tertullian the dictum read: After Baptism either satisfaction or punishment. If a mortal sin is committed, the sinner thereby loses the grace of God, and in that case he must turn to the "second plank," the sacrament of penance, in order that through the absolution of the priest he may receive a renewal of grace and thus be justified.

Luther knew that for the reception of grace the sinner must do "what is in him"—this was taught by both Thomists and Scotists. Luther also knew that, if the sinner would do what was in him, God would infallibly infuse grace. But as monk he had obligated himself to seek perfection, and therefore he could not be satisfied with anything less than contrition, the perfect sorrow (sorrow because of love to God). Luther had also heard from the "modern" teachers that such contrition was the ultimate and most perfect disposition for the reception of grace and that man could, if he so willed, by his natural powers love God above all things. However, the way of contrition did not work as far as Luther was concerned, for he seldom, if ever, felt contrition. Luther did not love God above all things, and the more he pondered over this problem, the less he loved the God who had ordained that contrition was a necessary disposition for the reception of grace.

Whenever Luther tried to make himself worthy of grace, he felt only attrition (sorrow because of fear of hell), the "repentance of the gallows." This he regarded as another sin, which he must confess and for which he must do penance. It is true, Luther had also heard from his teachers that very few ever attained contrition and that nearly all had to rely on attrition, and then by confessing their sins to a priest and receiving the words of absolution have their attrition transformed to contrition by the infusion of grace. But never do we read that Luther was ever satisfied with mere attrition. But supposing that Luther had been satisfied with attrition, could confession and absolution have quieted his conscience? After Luther had confessed his sins and received absolution, he did not feel contrition, for he did not love God. We must also remember that according to Catholic doctrine, absolution remits the guilt of sin and absolves from eternal punishment, but the sacrament of penance binds the sinner to temporal punishments, for which he must satisfy either here or in the hereafter.

Luther tried to make satisfaction, but he was never certain that he had perfectly satisfied. How, then, could he be certain that he was really a child of God and that he had not again committed a mortal sin? No; not the attrition doctrine, teaching that sorrow is meritorious, nor the words of absolution could bring peace to the conscience-stricken Luther.

In the Catholic Church the Gospel is the "new law." New or old, Luther was simply caught in the meshes of the Law and could not extricate himself. Luther thought he had committed a mortal sin and had thereby lost the grace of God. Trying to regain grace through the sacrament of penance, he labored to dispose himself for grace by contrition; but he felt no contrition. He sought peace in absolution and was bound to satisfaction. He endeavored to satisfy and thought he had not perfectly satisfied and had therefore lost the grace received through the sacrament. Again he had committed a mortal sin. Thus round and round he went and could find no way of escape. When had he really done what he ought to do? When had he done it perfectly? Here is proof that, if the justification of the sinner depends on a single thing that man must do, be this requirement ever so small and insignificant, the sinner must despair.

The specific Roman Catholic doctrine of justification can never assure a sinner that he actually has forgiveness. According to this doctrine, man is made righteous through the infusion of grace, and being made righteous, he has forgiveness of sin. However, when the sinner examines himself, he can only see and feel unrighteousness, no matter how many times he confesses his sins and no matter how many times he hears the words of absolution. Why? If the absolution granted by the priest within the Catholic Church were unconditional, then the sinner could be certain of having forgiveness. But, as pointed out previously, according to Catholic doctrine the priest remits only guilt and the eternal punishment but binds to temporal punishments, satisfaction which the sinner must make either in this world or in purgatory. The forgiveness granted in the Catholic Church through the absolution of the priest is therefore not a full and complete pardon but is conditioned by the satisfaction rendered for sin. Certainty of forgiveness can be found only where the words of absolution refer to, and proclaim, that objective absolution revealed in Christ's open grave. That absolution is complete and unconditional. That word alone can give peace of conscience. But that word Luther never heard in the Catholic Church.

But why is it, some one will ask, that all Catholics do not suffer the same doubts and misgivings which Luther suffered? Many do not realize the gravity of sin, and those who do realize

the gravity of sin rely on the Church to save them. They trust in the sacraments of the Church, in the help of the saints, and in their own good works. Besides, since the days of Gregory the Great (d. 604) it is regarded as presumptuous within the Catholic Church to even desire certainty of forgiveness; as long as he is in this world, the Catholic dares only to hope for salvation.

But there was another problem which caused Luther much grief, and that was the question of predestination. He met this question for the first time in the *Canon of the Mass*, by Biel; and when he began to study theology itself, he found it on the first pages of the first book of the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard. But with Luther predestination was not a philosophical but an intensely practical question, and in a soul already burdened with the problem of seeking grace through the sacraments this doctrine could only cause greater despair. The conflict with a God who saved only through the infusion of grace became even more bitter.

Since the days of Augustine most of the theologians were predestinarians, and in Duns Scotus and the "moderns" God became an arbitrary despot. As God wills according to His good pleasure, He predestinates or reprobates, grants or withholds grace. Luther continually asked the question: "Am I predestinated or reprobated?" But he was trying to build his house of faith "from the top," and therefore he fell down and "broke his neck." The conception of God solely as the Absolute Being, who rules and governs the world, without the message that God forgives our sins for the sake of Christ, made Luther's burden unbearable, and we can well understand why Luther feared and hated God. That God who has ordained the way of perfection and yet refuses to grant to some the necessary grace because He willed to reprobate them, cannot be loved but only feared and hated. And if Luther feared and hated God, how then could he have contrition, the necessary disposition for the worthy reception of grace according to the standards of the Roman Church? Again he felt he had committed a mortal sin.

During Luther's spiritual martyrdom there was especially one man who kept Luther from despair, and that was Johann von Staupitz. Staupitz had studied at Tuebingen a few years after Biel's death, but somehow he had come under the influence of the so-called mystic theology, and the emphasis on the death of Christ, found in mystic theology, gave Luther relative appeasement in the problem of predestination. When Luther was tormented with this question, Staupitz told him that "predestination is to be understood and found in the wounds of Christ" (*Tischr.*, II, No. 1, 491). This was a thoroughly Catholic doctrine, for Biel had advised his readers to hold fast to the ordained and revealed will of God. But it was Staupitz, the mystic, who continually

emphasized this fact and thereby tore Luther away from the "modern" speculation about the absolute God and caused him to look at the man called Christ (Tischr., I, No. 526).

The other problem which caused Luther much anguish was the sacrament of penance. Luther plagued and martyred himself in order that he might obtain that love to God which according to "modern" theology would give to him the ultimate and perfect disposition for the infusion of grace.* Here again it was Staupitz who mitigated his sorrow. (Enders, I:196.) Luther had placed the love of God as the goal of his labors, for through sorrow over sin he sought to obtain the love of God. Staupitz told him to place the love of God at the beginning. Because he loved God, therefore he should be sorry for sin. This was the theology of the Thomists. First love God and then because of love to God be sorry for your sins, and through such sorrow you will induce God to love you. "These words stuck in me like a sharp arrow and I began to compare the word penitence with the Scriptural passages which treat of repentance, and, lo, it became a most delightful exercise." Thus Staupitz turned Luther's thoughts into a different channel and furnished some relief. But Staupitz did not and could not bring real peace to Luther, first, because he did not know that perfect contrition has its source in God's love to man—because God loves man, therefore man should love God and be sorry for his sins†—and, secondly, because he (Staupitz) was a Catholic, laboring under the dictum, After Baptism either satisfaction or punishment. Peace was found by Luther through Paul when he learned to regard the "righteousness of God" not as the punitive righteousness of God, which the sinner must endeavor to satisfy through penance if he would obtain the love of God and escape punishment, but as the righteousness of God revealed in Christ, which God gives and imputes to the sinner and which the sinner receives by faith. But Luther's spiritual martyrdom was finally ended when he rejected that dictum, which had plagued the Christian Church since its earliest days, After Baptism either satisfaction or punishment. That was the real cause of Luther's martyrdom, and when that was proved false, then his spiritual martyrdom was at an end.

Morrison, III.

THEO. DIERKS

* The Scholastics distinguished, as noted before, between a sorrow because of the fear of hell (attrition) and a sorrow because of love to God (contrition). Luther on the basis of the Scriptures taught the repentance of the believer who accepts the forgiveness and pardon of God in Christ, which he called the *taegliche Reue und Busse*, and which is the fruit of faith in the forgiveness of sin.

† There is true contrition, the "*taegliche Reue und Busse*" of the Christian. Staupitz did not and could not teach Luther such contrition, for he himself did not know the doctrine of the objective reconciliation and justification.

Teaching Situations, Outlines, and Lesson Plans

One of the strangest distinctions which is observed when men are being *trained for* the ministry and, for that matter, when men are *in* the ministry, is that which prompts ministers to lay just about the exclusive emphasis of their office on preaching, that is, on delivering the sermons and addresses in public gatherings of the Christian congregation. No doubt this is the most conspicuous part of the ministry and one upon which success depends in a very vital way. We are prone to quote the statement from our Lutheran Confessions "Es ist kein Ding, das die Leute mehr bei der Kirche haelt denn die gute Predigt." It is true also that our Savior is frequently spoken of as a Preacher; in fact, Matthew opens the account of His public ministry with the significant remark: "From that time Jesus began to *preach* and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," chap. 4:17. Cp. chap. 11:1; Mark 1:38, 39; 2:2.

Yet it is surely not without significance and intention that the Bible even more frequently speaks of Jesus as a *Teacher* and that we have more discourses delivered by Him in a less formal way, interspersed with questions and stories, than we have regular sermons. The Sermon on the Mount, Matt. 5—7 (cp. Luke 6:20 ff.; 12:1 ff.), is an interesting example of the more formal type of the Lord's discourses. Yet it is said of Him at the close of this great sermon: "The people were astonished at His *doctrine*, for He *taught* them as one having authority and not as the scribes," Matt. 7:28 f. Cp. Matt. 13:54; Mark 4:2; 9:31; Luke 5:3; John 6:59; 8:2. He was, even to the leaders of the people, "a teacher come from God," John 3:2. If we take time to analyze the ministry of our Lord, we find to our amazement that He was master of all the devices which are now being advocated in the field of pedagogy in general and in that of religious education in particular, so that the account of the four evangelists, also from this angle, is exceedingly interesting and valuable to every one who takes his teaching ministry at all seriously.

The facts concerning the teaching activity of our Savior are undoubtedly intended to convey some meaning to us. We know of course that the Bible is not intended as a text-book on pedagogy, and yet the amazing thing is that it contains pedagogical maxims and other information which fully meet the requirements of a comprehensive philosophy of education and of a methodology that is thoroughly up to date in every respect. From the references given above, for example, we are bound to draw the conclusion that a teacher of the Word should not concentrate his efforts on the sermon alone, with only a perfunctory preparation for teaching classes of all kinds, but that he should apply the same diligence

he devotes to the making and delivering of sermons to a conscientious study and careful preliminary work on his less formal lessons in the Word of God. The Christian pastor cannot afford to rely upon some general impressions of catechetics as he remembers them from his seminary days, but he is in duty bound to make every effort toward increasing his efficiency as a teacher of old and young in every possible way.

Among the specific subjects which require constant study if a corresponding constant growth in teaching ability is to be evident is that of *teaching situations*. The term as here used requires some elucidation. A teaching situation includes all the factors which comprise the setting or furnish the background for proper instruction and training of a given individual or group. It is more than a mere intelligence level, although a good teacher will try to ascertain the intelligence quotient of his group at least, even if he cannot be sure of the I. Q. of every member of the group. It is a fact which seems to have been sufficiently substantiated that group or audience psychology will tend to produce a normal level of an entire group, a level which may, on the one hand, be somewhat lower than the I. Q. of the more brilliant members of the group, while, on the other hand, it will be somewhat higher than that of the dull members of the group. We are not now discussing the possible effect of this normalizing on the learning attitude or the results of learning in the case of the pupils with a high I. Q., but merely indicating what the teacher will probably have to expect in an audience setting. The intelligence level of every class must be reckoned with at the outset if the teaching situation which it controls, at least in part, is to receive due consideration on the part of the instructor.

But while this factor is primarily concerned with heredity, it is just as important that the religious instructor pay close attention to that of the environment of his pupils or students. We are fully aware of the fact that the quarrel between the hereditarians and the environmentalists has not yet been decided and that recent encounters between their forces have merely offered some good arguments on either side. Our teaching deals with factual, not theoretical, problems, and we must know whether the background of the people whom we are trying to teach is urban or rural, whether their social and the economic background place their thinking in that of the wealthy class of our country or merely in that of the well-to-do or even the poor, and whether they have been able to overcome the handicap of an inferiority complex so often found in the poor or in those who have been denied some of the amenities of life which we commonly associate with the better American way of living. That the social, educational, and cultural

background of the members of a group affect their thinking and hence also their learning in a very direct and vital way and hence materially influences the teaching situation, is generally conceded by teachers who combine scientific pedagogy with dispassionate observation.

The teaching situation, in the third place, must take into account psychological levels and psychological development. While the boundaries between the various levels are not absolutely defined, it seems that we can and should distinguish the following levels: that of the preschool age, including that of the nursery school and the kindergarten; early, middle, and late childhood; early, middle, and late adolescence; and the adult age, in which we may again distinguish between early manhood and womanhood, middle age, and old age. Each one of these levels has its peculiarities as to attitudes and interests, and it is the business of the educator to study these factors and to make use of them when he prepares his lesson plans and when he meets his classes. To deal with children of the preschool age in the same manner as with pupils of the confirmation age is manifestly poor pedagogy. The Christian educator will combine the results of the most careful observation with the findings of reliable psychologists in order to have a clear perception of the mind-set which he may expect in his classes.

The proper evaluation of the respective teaching situation requires, in the last place, that the Christian teacher carefully study the attitudes of his classes as groups and of the individuals in these classes toward the subject which he intends to present to them. It makes a big difference in the preparation of a lesson whether the members of the group concerned are sympathetic or unsympathetic to the topic or question to be treated, whether their attitude is positive or negative. It cannot be stated too frequently that the chief function of education is to get people to think; but few people can think except on the basis of previous personal experience. If the subject-matter seems to be foreign to their interests in life, they will hardly take the trouble to pay sufficient attention to facilitate the acquisition of knowledge or skills. The matter of race comes into consideration here, especially if the race is compelled to live under the handicap of segregation. Even the matter of sex enters into the picture, for the psychology of most women differs quite radically from that of men, and hence their interests, their attitudes, must be given full consideration. These are the viewpoints which must be kept in mind by the Christian teacher if he wishes to do justice to the task assigned to him in the various classes under his guidance.

It will hardly be necessary in this particular discussion to stress the need of gathering a sufficient amount of subject-material to

meet all possible contingencies of the lesson. The old pedagogical rule called for about eight times as much matter as one would actually need in the course of the hour or the period concerned. It is self-evident that the instructor will not attempt actually to offer all this food to his pupils. Nevertheless he must master the material, or, to use another picture, he must thoroughly digest and assimilate it, so that he can distribute the mass as he sees fit. To this end he will require a detailed outline of his subject-matter, with the main thoughts and the various subdivisions carefully arranged according to some definite plan. He may want his outline to be logical, unfolding the topic of the lesson in certain well-defined steps and moving on to the inevitable conclusion. Or he may prefer to arrange his material on the basis of psychological considerations, which very often agree with the intellectual level of his pupils. Naturally the question of general teaching procedures will also find consideration here. The teacher may want to arrange his subject-matter according to the inductive plan, as we commonly do in the case of younger children. Or he may be in a position to require logical conclusions from his pupils and therefore prefer the deductive procedure. Any kind of socialized procedure would require a still different outline. But whatever *form* the lesson may take, the conscientious teacher will never insult his pupils by stepping before them without a clear picture of the progress of the lesson in mind lest he fall into the error of a rambling discourse, which has no particular beginning, does not follow any specific order, and finally ends only because of inanition.

And now let us turn to the third chief point under consideration in this short paper, namely, that of *lesson plans*. A good many teachers formerly thought it quite sufficient if they taught on the basis of a somewhat sketchy outline and left everything else to the spur of the moment. The other extreme is represented by the very conservative exponents of the question-and-answer method in its strictest development, as it tries to anticipate the thinking of the pupils in its progression from point to point. Very few educators ever reached that stage in their teaching ability where they could do real teaching on the basis of a catechization that was worked out down to the last incidental question. On the other hand, nothing is more tedious than to listen to a teacher who is insufficiently prepared and resorts to stock phrases and glib definitions to cover up his lack of faithfulness in doing his work.

Yet it is by no means a superhuman task to prepare detailed lesson plans and to follow this procedure quite faithfully for at least ten years. In fact, it may be advisable to continue the habit of making and using lesson plans, at least at intervals, during one's entire professional life.

A lesson plan should include a number of steps. The first is the consideration of the teaching situation, as described above, so that the entire atmosphere of the lesson will be favorable to good teaching.

The second item which should appear on the lesson plan of the teacher is a statement of aims. This does not merely imply that the teacher will always be conscious of the general aim of Christian teaching, of the great objectives as laid down in the Word of God; for these considerations will permeate all his teaching, will be the background and foil of every lesson presented by him. But in addition to this factor every lesson should have its specific aim, its particular goal. Aimless teaching will rarely be good guidance, for it has not marked the way and therefore will not be apt to lead to a specific application. The questions which every teacher must ask himself as he prepares to teach a lesson are: What particular point do I want my pupils to get out of my presentation? What are they to take home with them and put to actual use in their lives? — Ordinarily the aim of the pupil is the correlate of that which the teacher has planned to present. The teacher should try to visualize the effect of his presentation and the response of the pupils to his suggestions and guidance. If he can succeed in having the pupils realize this aim and put the lesson into action in their lives, he may consider himself fortunate in his teaching.

The third step to be considered in the making of a lesson plan is the approach, which is naturally most intimately connected with the motivation of the lesson. From the great mass of suggestions concerning the forms of approach and motivation in religious teaching the following may be kept in mind. The *picture approach*, which is most effectively used in the case of little children but remains of importance throughout life, may present the psychological moment of the story to be taught at once and thus plunge the pupils into the midst of the lesson. A good many educators, however, prefer to use some other picture, one not related to the story to be taught, but one which will stimulate curiosity. The same effect may be achieved by means of diagrams or actual objects in hand, for every kind of visual approach is apt to be successful, especially when the teacher himself is deeply interested in the development of the lesson.

The *story approach* is very effective throughout the elementary school age and may continue to have value also in adult life, especially where the groups concerned are not accustomed to abstract thinking. The material may be taken from almost every kind of source, the entire field of literature, the daily papers and the current magazines, and even such tales as commonly go the rounds

in every community. The chief consideration is that the story be merely introductory, so that it only leads to the real topic of the lesson and does not divert from the aim which the teacher has set for himself.

Closely related to this form of motivation is the *approach from the field of experience*. Naturally this will not prove very effective in early and middle childhood, since many of the life experiences of children are blurred by their overactive imagination. But for older pupils, who have attained to a discrimination which enables them to separate romance from truth, and especially for adults, this kind of motivation will in most cases produce excellent results. Of course, the same caution applies here as in the previous instance, namely, that we should not emphasize the means at the expense of the end which we are attempting to reach.

A fourth form of approach is known as the *problem approach*. The problem presented by way of motivation may be based upon factual incidents, or the story may be fictitious. But as the name implies, it requires the instructor to introduce the lesson by presenting a complicated situation, preferably taken from life, though presented as hypothetical. It will usually open with the words "Suppose a person finds himself in such or such a position, with contingencies as follows, . . . what would you suggest that he should do?" This opening leads to the topic of the lesson. It is very effective if not overdone.

Some teachers find that the so-called *liturgical approach* yields good results. In this case the motivation leading to the topic of the lesson is taken from some part of the Church's liturgy and naturally requires a thorough familiarity with the entire liturgy and its significance on the part of the instructor.

A sixth form of approach is that which *employs an object or symbol* to stir the imagination and provoke thought. Since we have the rich symbolism of the Lutheran Church to operate with, there should be no dearth of objects which may be introduced. Both children and adults are observant enough to note the ornamentation in pictures, diagrams, and symbols as commonly employed in our church buildings and parish-halls, and this rich fund will hardly be exhausted in a lifetime of teaching.

The seventh approach is known as the *doctrinal*, which, as its name implies, makes use of the inductive procedure. It makes use either of the inner relationship between various doctrines and therefore works along logical lines, or it makes use of the principle of contrast in order to challenge the imagination of the pupils. A teacher may well present a false doctrine, as taught in a sectarian church-body, and then suggest to his class that this doctrine be examined in the light of the Word of God, the mode of procedure

then being that employed in Biblical theology, which usually carries conviction to the student.

It stands to reason that the alert teacher will often use a combination of these various forms of motivation or that he will discover others which can be applied with good success. It will be best for him to remember at all times that the requirement in the lower grades is chiefly to stimulate curiosity and arouse interest, while the upper grades of the elementary school demand that he meet the psychological level of the children. During the post-confirmation age the approach must be based upon the contacts with life established by the young people and by the interests which they develop, and in adults the instructor must strive to meet the thinking of his pupils with reference to social and economic conditions with which they are concerned.

P. E. KRETZMANN

Some Observations on the Vocabulary of the Fourth Gospel

The fact is well known that the "disciple whom Jesus loved" frequently employs such simple but withal deeply significant terms as "life," "light," "truth," etc., and their antonyms, words and phrases totally lacking in the synoptic gospels.

The Gospel of St. John has none of the terms translated "compassion," or "pity" (ἔλεος, ἐλεέω, σπλαγχνίζομαι), although the synoptists have thirty-three of them. John supersedes them with ἀγάπη, and its verb ἀγαπάω. The noun is exclusively Biblical, used by both the LXX and the New Testament. The assumption that the "Great Prayer to Isis" (Oxyrhynchus Papyrus No. 1,380), composed in the second century A. D., may have called Isis ἀγάπη in the North Egyptian coast town of Thonis (line 28), or even ἀ(γά)πη θεῶν in Italy (according to a more or less doubtful restoration in line 109), does no violence to this claim. As early as the second century a gradual interchange between Christian and pagan vocabularies began to take place; indeed, it is difficult to draw the line always to determine just which expression was exclusively Christian and which pagan. So, for instance, some of the early Christian writers had no scruples to use ἔρω, love between the sexes, in place of the apostolic ἀγάπη. Theodoret writes: "He who hath received the divine love (ὁ τὸν ἔρωτα τὸν θεῖον δεξάμενος) despises all earthly things"; but Theodoret did not despise the use of the very earthly ἔρω. Ignatius uses the noteworthy expression: "My love hath been crucified" (ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρω ἐσταύρωται). Origen interpreted ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρω of Christ and thus gives evidence by the introduction of ἔρω into the Christian vocabulary for the departure from apostolic care

and purity of expression. By the same token it is not impossible for pagan phraseology to be touched by the ever-growing Christian vocabularies, particularly of the Apologists.

The sacred writers, and among them St. John, while employing the Greek language, "the noblest and most subtle instrument of human speech ever invented," repudiated certain pagan terms which might involve the acceptance of unworthy heathen ideals and purposes. At the same time they appropriated to a nobler and Christian use such terms as conveyed the expression of what was best and purest in pre-Christian thought. This fundamental method is still employed by Bible-translators of today.

But when we say that ἀγάπη is exclusively Biblical, we make reference to the truth that Christianity literally revealed a new life, made a new life possible, and thus required a new vocabulary to express the new conditions. Thus words came into use which in some cases were absolutely new coinings; in others they were so charged with fresh meaning as to be the equivalent of new words.

To St. John (1st Ep., 4:8) ἀγάπη expresses the very essence of the divine nature. It also expresses the greatest Christian grace, the sacred bond of Christian society, the fulfilment of the new law bequeathed by the Lord to His disciples. 'Αγάπη is not classical in the sense of being found in the writings of Greek authors of antiquity. The LXX use it, however, and it may therefor have been a colloquial word before it took its place in Biblical literature. But the LXX use differs widely from its use in the New Testament. There it is used in a sense identical with ἔρω, a sense absolutely excluded from the New Testament. In the sense of ἔρω the new word occurs in 2 Sam. 13:15.

As far as its history was concerned, ἀγάπη could not present an unblemished record for admittance into the Christian vocabulary. But if the choice lay between ἀγάπη and ἔρω, as it surely did, then there could be little doubt as to the decision. Although Plato had idealized ἔρω to such a degree that all civilized tongues still can speak of "Platonic love," ἔρω was nevertheless so steeped into the worst associations of pagan life as to render it ill fitted to convey the sublime message of divine love. 'Αγάπη, on the other hand, with its literary newness, its suggestion of pure and self-sacrificing affection (as should indeed be present in connubial love), became an apt instrument of expression in the gospels, particularly that of St. John. It occurs twice only in the synoptic gospels: Luke (11:42) modifies it by τοῦ θεοῦ; our Lord uses the word when He prophesies the coldness of love in these latter days, ψυχήσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν, the love of the many will wax cold, Matt. 24:12.

In the fourth gospel ἀγάπη is used eight times, most often in chapter 15. The epistles of St. John have it nineteen times; it is

found twice in Revelation. In the remaining apostolic writings few important words occur as often as ἀγάπη. Christianity itself is summed up in ἀγάπη.

Eternal, αἰώνιος, lasting for an age, or even longer than the ages, as contrasted with that which is brief and fleeting, is not only more frequent with John, but he always uses it with ζωή. If life is brief and fleeting, it is not so with the beloved disciple: In Christ it is a life eternal, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον, 3:36, *et al.*

A form of ἐρευνάω, I search, not known before the first century A. D., is ἐραυνάω. It occurs nowhere in the synoptic gospels, but John has it in the celebrated passage 5:39 and in 7:52. Ἐραυνάτε is now commonly taken to be a statement rather than a command. The Lord was here making an assertion with an implied condemnation. His opponents to whom He here addresses Himself were as a matter of fact in the habit of searching their own Scriptures, because they thought they had eternal life in them. They were mistaken in this, for eternal life is not in the Scriptures apart from Him of whom these same Scriptures testified. They were wrong, indeed not in searching the Scriptures, but in doing so with prejudiced minds and mistaken motives and refusing to come to Him who is the Life and the Light of men.

Strikingly the first seven verbs in the Johannine gospel fall into two groups: εἰμί, four times; then γίνομαι, three times: the Word "was"; everything else "became." As an ellipse is described about its two foci, so all philosophy is said to be involved in these two concepts, εἰμί, I am, and γίνομαι, I become. Common English parlance has no fine distinction here, but the German differentiates between *sein* and *werden*, as also the subtle Spanish with its two verbs *ser* and *estar*. The Greek is always very careful to distinguish between the two.

John in his vocabulary observes a fine discrimination where the absoluteness of the Deity in contrast to the relativity of whatever is human is under consideration. "Before Abraham came to be, I am," 8:58, says the Lord. The eternal Son is not in the same category as Abraham, who had no being until a given point in time. Subsequently, the Word *became* flesh; without ceasing to be what He ever had been, He became what previously He was not; and so our salvation is bound up with Him who eternally *was* and yet in time *became*. The force of γίνομαι can be recognized from such passages as speak of a change in the nature or appearance of something. At Christ's first miracle, water *became* wine; remaining fluid and a beverage, it took to itself new qualities and became what it was not before.

Stephen became the first in a long line of Christian martyrs,

but the verb μαρτυρέω does not occur in Mark; it is found once in each Matthew (22:31) and Luke (4:22); while it is extremely common in John, being found there thirty-three times.

John's gospel has no parables, and the word παραβολή is entirely absent, while frequent enough among the other three. But παροιμία occurs in John 10:6; 16:25, 29. Elsewhere in the New Testament it will be found only 2 Pet. 2:22, employed by John's lone companion in the morning race to the empty tomb. Παροιμία is a "cryptic saying," a "veiled speech," a way of stating things "beside the common way" (παρά and ὁμός).

The Doric form πιάζω, I seize, apprehend, arrest, etc., occurs eight times in John, but is not found in the synoptists, although Luke employs it Acts 3:7 and 12:4.

The famous noun πίστις occurs 24 times in the synoptic gospels, but is never used by St. John. On the other hand, its verb, πιστεύειν, while employed only 36 times by the synoptists, is used over 100 times by St. John. Certain heretics, like Celsus, later, might say that πίστις simply means "credulity" or, in its earlier pagan meaning, a certain "intellectual conviction"; but St. John's persistent use of πιστεύειν forbids such shallow interpretation.

A further peculiar feature of John's vocabulary is that προσεύχομαι and προσευχή (pray and prayer) are never used by him, while the synoptists have these words 54 times. Neither has John μετανοέω and μετάνοια (repent and repentance), although these occur 24 times in the three other gospels.

These few observations on St. John's vocabulary do not purport to be exhaustive and all-inclusive, but they serve to show that a comparison of the evangelists' vocabularies yields rich reward in stimulating and often revealing study.

R. T. DU BRAU



Outlines on the Wuerttemberg Gospel Selections

Fourth Sunday after Epiphany

John 4:19-26

Throughout the world men engage in what they regard as divine worship (churches, shrines, pagan temples, rituals of cults and savage tribes, schools and homes). How many of these are "true worshipers," such as "the Father seeketh" (v. 23)?

And what of our own worship, both in the house of God and in our private chambers? We take for granted that this is "true worship," a benefit to ourselves and an acceptable sacrifice to God. But is it? Let us judge our own worship in the light of the present passage, the first recorded teaching of Jesus on this important subject.

The Only True Worship of God

1. *Wherein it consists*
2. *What is required for it*

1

A) The woman realized that she was in the presence of a prophet. (Context, v. 19.) Hence she asked a question that had been troubling her, v. 20.

B) Instead of answering the woman directly, Jesus goes to the very heart of her problem. Fundamentally she has a wrong conception of what the worship of God really is. Hence Jesus instructs her on the *essence* of divine worship.

1) Jesus says: "*God is a Spirit*," v. 24. This fact must be basic in all our teaching on divine worship as well as in our worship itself. Since God does not have a body, He is not confined to any one place, be it Mount Gerizim or Jerusalem. He is omnipresent, Jer. 23:23, 24. Accordingly, the place where we worship is of no importance. The fact that our bodies are at one place or at another cannot bring us closer to God nor remove us farther from Him; for God is a spirit filling heaven and earth, and men can enter into communion with Him no matter where they may be, Acts 17:24.

2) True worship is essentially a matter of *the spirit*. Since God is a spirit, "they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit," v. 24. The spirit, the soul, the heart of man, must enter into communion with God; otherwise there can be no divine worship. Worship is a spiritual exercise and does not consist in repairing to temples, engaging in rituals, assuming worshipful postures, or speaking prayers. True, all these things, if properly used, may be an aid to divine worship, but in themselves they neither constitute worship nor represent an integral part of it, Acts 17:25.

3) However, before there can be such an intimate spiritual communion between man and God, there must be *harmony* between them. "There must be harmony between God and His worshipers; such as God is must His worship be. This is according to a principle which prevails throughout the universe: we look for correspondence between an object and the organ to which it reveals or yields itself. The eye has an inner fitness for the light, the ear for sound. The man who would truly worship God, would find and know and possess and enjoy God, must be in harmony with Him, must have a capacity for receiving Him. Because God is *spirit*, we must worship *in spirit*. As God is, so His worshiper." (Andrew Murray.)

Application. — Do we always realize this? Do we not often act as though the mere going to church, singing hymns, reading the Bible, speaking prayers and engaging in religious ceremonies were in themselves true acts of worship? No one can deny that we are inclined to emphasize the external features of our worship at the expense of its very essence, the spiritual communion with God. In some respects we are still in danger of drifting into the position of the Samaritan woman. Let us therefore stress the spiritual side of our worship and strive always to worship God in spirit.

But what is required for such genuine spiritual worship?

2

A) *Sincerity.* This is implied in the words "in spirit," v. 24. A mere mechanical recitation of prayers and an external performance of ceremonies is no worship at all. True worship always springs from the heart, Matt. 7:21; 15:8.

B) However, sincerity is not enough. Untold numbers of persons worship with the utmost sincerity, and yet their worship is in vain, for it is not the kind of worship that "the Father seeketh," v. 23. If we would worship "in spirit," we must worship "*in truth*," v. 24. This implies —

1. That we do not worship an unknown god, as certain Greeks did in the day of Paul, Acts 17:23, and as the Samaritan woman did, v. 22. In other words, we must bring our spiritual sacrifices to a God whom we have learned to know and love as our Father.

2) This is possible only through Jesus, v. 26. He alone is the Truth, John 14:6, and only through and in Him can we worship God in truth, John 16:23; Matt. 21:22.

3) A mere intellectual knowledge of the teachings of Jesus or the mechanical repetition of His name will not suffice, however. In order to worship God "in spirit and in truth," we must have

entered into spiritual communion with Him by faith in Christ Jesus. Without saving faith, which, after all, is something far superior to mere confidence in God, there can be no true worship. Worshiping in the name of Jesus presupposes believing in Him as our Savior.

Conclusion. — Recapitulation. May we give due and continual attention to our worship of God, so that with His help we may ever become more successful as true worshippers!

E. J. FRIEDRICH

Septuagesima

Matt. 11:16-24

John the Baptist's embassy to Christ gave opportunity for instruction concerning the great ministry of the forerunner, Matt. 11:1-15, but also for a reprimand because of the refusal of the Jews to accept either John's or Christ's ministry, and an admonition to repentance.

Christ's Warning against Despising God's Word

1. *He complained against the generation of His day*
2. *He upbraided the cities which had witnessed special grace*

I

The generation of Christ's day enjoyed God's special favor. The greatest preachers of all time, Jesus and John (Matt. 11:11), preached among them. Prophets had emphasized the exceptional greatness of that day. Is. 40:1-11; Mal. 3:1; Is. 9:2-7; 61:1-3 (cf. Luke 4:17-19); Is. 11; Amos 9:11, 12; Micah 5:1-3.

John had begun his brief but remarkable ministry about six months before Christ was baptized by him. John was very austere, rigid in his personal discipline, odd in appearance, refusing to indulge in strong drink and rich food, v. 18; Luke 1:15; Matt. 3:4; 9:14. Jesus, however, "came eating and drinking," v. 19. He did not distinguish Himself from ordinary men, did not preach and practice abstinence, but was sociable, mingled with men, wore customary clothing, and partook of food and drink as other men do.

Christ's generation, especially those influenced by pharisaism, rejected both John and Jesus. They said John had a devil, v. 18. They did not want to hear his call to repentance, Matt. 3:7-12. — They called Jesus a glutton and wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners, v. 18; Matt. 9:10-13; Luke 7:39; Luke 15. They resented the thought of salvation by grace. They wanted no Savior from sin.

Jesus likened "this generation" to the foolish, capricious children of the streets and the market-places, vv. 16, 17, never willing

to do what others desire, but acting very selfishly. "This generation" was centered upon self, upon earthly affairs.

The world today presents the same classes of people. They want neither John nor Jesus. John's preaching of the Law hurts their feelings. Jesus' salvation for the helpless sinner is even more repulsive to them. Take to heart Christ's warning!

2

Chorazin and Bethsaida were cities near Capernaum which Jesus often touched on His journeys. Their people had heard the impressive sermons of Christ repeatedly. They had also witnessed some of His mighty miracles, Mark 6:45; 8:22; Luke 9:10; John 6:1-13. However, they had not heeded His call nor regarded His miracles. Tyre and Sidon, coast cities, notoriously wicked, against which God's curse had been prophesied, Is. 23:1; Ezek. 26:2-3; 27:2; Zech. 9:2; Jer. 25:22; 27:3; Joel 3:9, would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes, v. 21. What an inexcusable rejection of God's grace!

Capernaum, Christ's headquarters during the greater part of His active ministry, had surely experienced a superabundant outpouring of God's grace. Her people had heard many sermons and seen many outstanding miracles of Christ. However, they had rejected God's grace. Extremely wicked Sodom "would have remained until this day" if it had witnessed such mighty works.

Jesus emphasized the serious consequences for the cities that despised God's grace, vv. 22, 24. The greater the grace, the greater is the responsibility, and the more severe will be the judgment for those who neglect it.

Our day is noted for despising God's grace: worldly-mindedness, indifference to church attendance and Holy Communion, Sunday-school, Bible classes, unbelief, ridicule of sacred things, denial of miracles, etc. Are these things making inroads upon our churches? Let us be warned. God's grace is bestowed upon us for a definite purpose — our salvation. We shall obtain salvation only by God's grace. (Luther's explanation of the Third Commandment.)

J. W. BEHNKEN

Sexagesima

John 8:21-29

In the passage preceding our text we find the Jews, especially those of the ruling class, in repeated altercation with Jesus in an endeavor to trap Him. How eager and determined they were to put Him out of the way! Always they are unsuccessful. Do they not finally desist from further attempts? No. In this text we again find them in an altercation with Him. How do they fare?

The Jews in Their Altercation with Jesus

1. *They are warned against their sin of unbelief*
2. *They are made to feel that their unbelief is without excuse*
3. *They are warned of the disaster which their unbelief will bring upon them*

1

Vv. 21-24. "I go My way." You Jews may plot and scheme, yet I am going of My own free will and accord. Jesus does not tell the Jews where He is going. That was not necessary; He has told them before. The time will come when ye shall seek Me in despair. Too late. What a warning against their unbelief! They ignore it and catch merely at His last words, saying: v. 22. Jesus pays no attention to their remarks but proceeds to repeat and stress His warning, v. 23. Their origin is mundane, His is heavenly, divine. He has come into their midst to save them and is well able to do so. If they reject Him, they shall die in their sins. They need not; there is still a way of escape. Jesus is not only warning them against their unbelief; His heart goes out to them in sympathy and mercy; He would still win them over.

The unbelieving world of today is also engaged in an altercation with Jesus, rejecting, denying, ridiculing His statements in His Word. Christ is warning them, pointing out to them to what their unbelief must inevitably lead. At the same time He is pleading with them to turn to Him for salvation before it is too late. — We are Christians. Are we? Let us make sure of it, 2 Cor. 13:5. And then we are ever exposed to the danger of apostasy, 1 Pet. 5:8. We are surrounded by the unbelieving world; the voice of unbelief presses into our homes over the radio. Our own reason is always ready to engage in an altercation with Jesus and His Word. Let us heed the warning of Jesus against unbelief. The day of grace, still before us, will soon be spent.

2

V. 25. The Jews, especially their leaders, make no excuse for their unbelief. They have none. But they are made to feel the impossibility of an excuse. The very fact that they try to sidestep the warning of Jesus, v. 22, shows that they are at a loss for an excuse. And then v. 25. They do not here ask for further information regarding the person of Christ. He has told them often enough and is just now telling them. This is rather a sneer, "You, who are you anyway?" — That is the way of unbelievers today. They make no excuse because they have none. When pressed, they change the subject or strike at some minor point to avoid the warning against their unbelief. At last they take to

ridicule and vituperation. Frequently they try to stifle their inner conviction by loud mouthings. There simply is no excuse for unbelief.

Vv. 26, 27. Jesus need not say anything more about Himself, but He has many things to say and to judge of them, especially that they do not believe. And what He says is true, for He that sent Him is true; and Jesus says only those things which He heard of Him who sent Him. What excuse is there for disbelieving the truth? — Christ is speaking the truth in the world today through the Bible, Christian preachers, testimony of Christians, etc. What excuse can be offered today for rejecting the truth, especially the truth of salvation in Christ? What excuse can we who have the Word of Truth in such abundance offer if we yield to unbelief?

3

Vv. 28, 29. Even though the Jews lift up the Son of Man on the cross, they cannot bring disaster upon *Him*; for He does always those things which please the Father, also in giving up His life. The Father has not left Him alone; the two are always together. By crucifying Jesus, the enemies cannot separate Him from the Father. He is carrying out the work for which He has been sent. His work will be done even though they try to frustrate it. As the Father has taught Him, He speaks these things, and they cannot hush His voice. — All unbelievers should bear this in mind. The work of Christ and of His Word will go on; He will continue to build and expand His kingdom in spite of the machinations, vilifications, and loud mouthings of all unbelievers.

The Jews are bringing disaster only upon *themselves*. When they will have lifted up the Son of Man, they will know that He is the Son of God and the Savior of mankind. But then their realization will be too late. Having rejected the only Savior and having died in their sins, they have then to face the Judge. Eternal disaster will be their well-deserved doom. — That will be the lot of all unbelievers. They die in their sins, perish, sink into eternal torment. — Is there a lesson in this for us? Indeed. What else have we to look forward to if we yield to unbelief? Watch and pray; use means of grace diligently; be faithful unto death. Then not disaster but eternal bliss.

R. NETTZEL

Quinquagesima

Matt. 16:21-23

Quinquagesima Sunday the door to the Lenten season when we, in special services, begin to show forth (v. 21) the sufferings and death of our Savior. If these special meditations are to bring

us spiritual blessings, we must not attempt to judge these things according to our reason but view them in the light of God's revelation. And that is the lesson contained in our text.

How must We Study the Passion of Christ?

1. *We must not permit our reason to judge it*
2. *We must view it in the light of God's revelation*

1

V. 21. The God-appointed time when His only-begotten Son should give His life for the salvation of sinners was at hand. Having thoroughly shown His disciples that in Him the prophecies of the Old Testament find their fulfilment, Jesus now begins to tell them in detail what would soon happen to Him. The highest court in Israel would prosecute Him for teaching a false religion. It would make Him suffer and die; but He would be raised again on the third day. Jesus is here speaking of His forthcoming Passion.

The reaction of the disciples. Impulsive Peter is their spokesman, v. 22. He is startled, shocked, stunned, so much so that what Jesus said about His resurrection escaped his notice. He takes the Lord aside and vehemently admonishes Him. God be merciful to Thee, the good Lord help Thee from this! What Jesus has told the disciples is repulsive to his reason.

V. 23. Never before had Jesus spoken so severely to one of His disciples. He calls Peter Satan. He saw that Satan used Peter as his tool to prevent Jesus from saving the world. Thus Peter, as a tool of Satan, became a trap, a snare, for our Savior. He was also proud. He would be wiser than his Lord. The Lord must be the fool who does not know how to avoid danger. How impertinent and arrogant is Peter!

And all this because he permitted his reason to pass judgment on the Passion of Christ. By thinking the things that are of men, by viewing the story of the Passion of Christ in the light of human reason, he follows the promptings of the devil and thereby destroys salvation for himself. That is the very thing the Jews did. Therefore they became the murderers of the Prince of Life.

The Modernists also take the heart out of the Christian religion by refusing to accept salvation by the atoning suffering and death of Christ. They are proud in their imagined wisdom, and the Bible must be wrong. The crucified Christ is unto the Jews a stumbling-block and unto the Greeks foolishness, 1 Cor. 1:23. Yes, the Passion of Christ is repulsive to our reason. Therefore we must beware lest our reason become Satan's tool and destructively criticize what God has ordained for our salvation.

2

V. 23. Christ tells Peter that he should have savored the things that are of God. When He explained to him the coming events, His suffering at the hands of the Jews, he should have, though startled and perplexed, restrained his reason. Reason, be still; the Lord is speaking. I shall ask Him to explain why He lets all these terrible things happen to Him. Lord, why must Thou go to Jerusalem? What is the purpose, etc.? And the Lord could have reminded Peter of instructions given before, could have spoken of great prophecies, such as Is. 53, and explained the wonderful plan of merciful God to save the lost and condemned sinners. Yes, the time soon came when Peter and his fellow-disciples understood this merciful plan and became eloquent and convincing preachers of the Gospel of grace for sinners by the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

What our reason cannot comprehend God has revealed to us. In the light of this divine revelation we must view the Passion of Christ. Then we shall accompany our Savior on His way from Gethsemane to Golgotha as such as realize that it is our sins for which He suffers and dies, but that just in this way we are saved from death and damnation. His resurrection is proof for it. And we shall rejoice in our salvation, praise Him, love Him, and become eager to tell all the world about this wonderful plan of God.

H. J. BOUMAN



Miscellanea

Theses on Unionism

(Submitted to, and approved by, the Convention of the North Dakota and Montana District of the Missouri Synod, June, 1940)

1. Through the preaching of the Gospel and through Holy Baptism God makes people believers. By making them believers, He not only unites them closely with Christ, but He unites them with each other that they form one body, the holy Christian Church.

2. This body we call an invisible one because the bond uniting the Christians is not one that can be seen, something outward, but it is altogether inward, faith in the Redeemer.

3. This inward unity, however, is to find expression in the attitude of Christians toward each other. They are not to ignore one another. There is not to be strife and conflict between them. They are to be brethren jointly traveling to the home above. They are to assist each other as members of one and the same body.

4. If it were not for sin, all believers in Jesus Christ would be united and living in harmony and peace, all believing the same Gospel, all having and cherishing the same Sacraments, all following the precepts of the divine Word. Sin has made this happy state impossible.

5. The Word of God tells us a great deal about the attitude of Christians toward each other. It inculcates love, sympathy, and helpfulness.

6. Through their evil nature or the wiles of Satan, Christians may be cast into a life of service of sin, losing their faith, ceasing to be Christians. In such a situation their former fellow-Christians must cease to regard them as brethren, 1 Cor. 5:11-13. In this case it is gross sin which cuts the bond between people who before recognized each other as belonging together. Cf. also Matt. 18:15-18.

7. A life of sin is not the only thing that can disrupt the pleasant relations that should prevail among people calling themselves Christians. Persistent, stubborn adherence to false doctrines likewise must disrupt the fraternal relationship in which Christians are to stand toward each other.

8. That false doctrine is dangerous and a thing which Christians must oppose can be shown from the warnings of the Scriptures against false teaching. Cf., for instance, Gal. 5:9; 1:8.

9. The Bible speaks of division-makers, Rom. 16:17; Titus 3:10. Division-makers are people that create dissension in the Church, or factionalism; where there is unity, they bring in disunity.

10. Such division-makers may do their mischievous work through fomenting a party spirit, seeking to become prominent or to obtain a leading position in a church.

11. Quite commonly, however, such divisions are caused by men who advocate false teaching, presenting doctrines which are contrary

to what the Gospel teaches. By seeking to draw the members of the Church over to their views, they cause strife and dissension and destroy the unity of the Church.

12. The motive leading these division-makers to split the Church is pride, vanity, and unwillingness to subject themselves to the Word of God.

13. The Bible definitely tells us that these division-makers are dangerous and that, if they will not listen, we shall have to separate from them. This applies not only to the division-makers themselves but likewise to their followers.

14. Unionism is the attitude which condones the work of those causing divisions through false doctrine and is willing to overlook their wrong course. According to unionism we may have fellowship with division-makers.

15. The arguments of the supporters of unionism are various.

a. Some unionists declare that on certain doctrines the Bible is not clear enough to justify us in opposing those who reject these doctrines. For instance, some of them hold that concerning the Lord's Supper the Bible does not speak with so much clearness that we can definitely say that the Lutheran doctrine is the doctrine of the Bible and whoever refuses to teach it is disobedient to the Scriptures.

b. Other unionists deny the full authority of the Scriptures. While they are willing to grant in a general way that the Bible possesses authority, that we must follow its teachings, they refuse to extend this authority to the points of difference between Christian denominations. The thoroughgoing unionists deny both the authority and the clarity of the Scriptures.

c. Quite commonly it is maintained that love for our fellow-men must compel us to take a unionistic course.

16. We say that the course of the unionists is anti-Scriptural for the following reasons:

a. The Bible definitely forbids us to sanction or condone false doctrine; unionism sponsors indifference toward false doctrine.

b. The Bible furthermore definitely demands that we part company with the division-makers and do not recognize them as our brethren; unionism ignores this divine injunction.

c. The Bible definitely tells us we must love our brethren. But love demands that we oppose an error when we find a brother afflicted with it, while unionism ignores such an error.

d. The Word of God and our conscience prescribe love of the truth; unionism is lukewarm, at least with respect to some truths, a lukewarmness which may soon gain control of one's attitude toward all revealed truth.

e. Ordinary every-day honesty and uprightness should compel us not to appear as brethren of those who are not our brethren; unionism pretends that there is unity where in reality it is absent.

17. When false teaching leads Christians to separate from those who propound false teaching and thus a division is caused, the blame does

not lie with the Christians who adhere to the truth, but with those who have set the divine revelation aside.

18. The fact that some people have gone too far in their opposition to unionism and have become separatists must not lead us to adopt the opposite extreme and to become lax and indifferent in upholding purity of doctrine.

W. ARNDT

The Federal Theory of Imputation

The following paragraphs on the Federal Theory of Imputation, or, as Dr. Augustus Strong also calls it, the Theory of Condemnation by Covenant, owe their origin to a request for a brief presentation of the subject in simple, popular language. In the letter occur, among others, the questions: "Why does Dr. F. Pieper in his *Christliche Dogmatik*, which, after all, is a fairly exhaustive work, not explain the theory at any greater length? Has it no worth-while historic significance?"

Dr. Strong, in his comprehensive *Systematic Theology* (Vol. II, pp. 612 ff.), treats Federalism among the "theories of imputation" of which he mentions the *Pelagian* ("The sin of Adam is imputed only to Adam, not to his descendants"); the *Arminian* ("God imputes to each man his inborn tendencies to evil only when he consciously and voluntarily appropriates and ratifies these, in spite of the power to the contrary, which, in justice to man, God has specially communicated"); the *New School Theory* of Hopkins, Emmons, Dwight, Taylor, Finney, etc., who rejected the Puritan anthropology of Edwards and Bellamy ("God imputes to men their own acts of personal transgression; He does not impute to them Adam's sin; neither original vitiosity nor physical death are penal inflictions but simply consequences which God in His sovereignty ordained to mark His displeasure at Adam's transgression and subject to which evils God immediately creates each human soul"); the *Theory of Mediate Imputation*, or *Theory of Condemnation for Depravity*, defended by Placeus (de la Place) at Saumur (1606—1655) in France ("All men are born physically and morally depraved, which native depravity is the source of all actual sins and is itself sin; it is this native depravity only which God imputes to men"); the *Augustinian Theory*, or *Theory of Adam's Headship*, set forth in detail by St. Augustine, though held also in its essential features by Tertullian, Hilary, Ambrose, the chief Calvinistic theologians of the Reformation period, Zwingli excepted, in modern times by Drs. Shedd and Baird, and so quite generally in orthodox Reformed circles ("God imputes the sin of Adam immediately to all his posterity in virtue of that *organic unity of mankind* by which the whole race at the time of Adam's transgression existed, not individually, but *seminally*, in him as its head"); and immediately before this, the *Federal Theory*, or the *Theory of Condemnation by Covenant*, which was developed chiefly by John Koch, more generally known as Cocceius, and after his death by Francis Burman and Hermann Witsius (University of Utrecht), in modern times especially by the old Princeton school (Dr. Chas. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, II, pp. 197 ff.), after the theory had been integrated more definitely into the general scheme of Calvinistic determinism by Francis Turretin (1623—1687). Cocceius himself laid down his views chiefly in his *Summa Doctrinae*

de Foedere et Testamento Dei (1648) and *Summa Theologiae*, as also in his *Ultima Mosis*. He was professor of exegetical and doctrinal theology at Leyden (1650—1669), a voluminous, though not always sound and dependable writer in the fields of exegesis, Biblical theology, dogmatics, and ethics. For those who cannot study more detailed works on the subject the doctrinal compends of Strong and Hodge (also of Shedd), Meusel's *Kirchliches Handlexikon*, the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*, and, above all, the scholarly *Cyclopaedia of McClintock and Strong* will furnish adequate and dependable information. In its brief, pithy way the *Concordia Cyclopaedia* says *sub Cocceius*: "... founder of Federal Theology (covenant of works before man's fall, of grace after man's fall, latter subdivided into the antelegal, the legal, and the post-legal dispensation)."

We quote this brief characterization of Koch's Federalism because it is a rather adequate summary of his teaching on the subject. In other words: Originally God made with Adam a covenant of *nature* or of *works*, and had Adam not sinned, he and his descendants would have continued in, and been saved by, that original covenant of works. However, when Adam fell into sin, God, in His infinite mercy, established a new covenant with Adam, and in him with his descendants, namely, the covenant of grace, including the whole *ordo salutis*—redemption by Christ, the effectual vocation, the final preservation, and the eternal glorification of the elect. The antelegal, legal, and postlegal dispensations of Koch need not concern us, since, after all, they are non-essential; but what does concern us as we study the Federal Theory is that it endeavors to offer a more reasonable explanation of the imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants, supplementary to, and rationally more acceptable than, the old Augustinian doctrine, which presumes that in Adam all his descendants were "seminally" as in their head. ("The total life of humanity was then in Adam"; Strong.) With this doctrine the theory of Koch is really not substantially at variance; it rather expands and more reasonably motivates Augustinianism, so that some Reformed divines (e.g., Turretin) could embrace in their views the elements of both systems. With Adam as their representative, God entered into a covenant with all men, agreeing to bestow upon them eternal life on condition of his obedience, but making the penalty of his disobedience to be the corruption and death of all his posterity. (Cf. Strong, II, p. 612.) Federalism thus offers a supposed legal ground or justifying cause of the imputation; it makes the imputation a matter of the breach of the first covenant, of which the first man became guilty. Both systems therefore declare that God imputes Adam's sin to his descendants as their head; but while Augustinianism regards Adam as the *natural* head, Federalism specifies him as the *covenant* head. The great body of Calvinistic theologians in the 17th century could therefore, as Strong correctly points out, be Augustinians as well as Federalists, as Owen, the Westminster Confession, etc. Calvin guardedly expressed himself on the point in the two propositions: 1. We are not condemned for Adam's sin apart from our own inherent depravity, which is derived from him, the sin for which we are condemned

being our own. 2. This sin is ours because our nature is vitiated in Adam, and we receive it in the condition in which it was put by the first transgression. (Cf. Strong, II, p. 613.) In these propositions we miss the Scriptural doctrine of the imputation of Adam's guilt, as our own Lutheran divines so clearly teach this on the basis of Scripture.

Some of Strong's objections to the Federal Theory (he himself favored undiluted Augustinianism) are well taken. He shows, for example, that the Federal Theory is extra-Scriptural, there being no mention of such a covenant with Adam in the account of man's trial and all Scripture-passages adduced in support of Federalism being without proof value (cf. Hos. 6:7; 8:1,2; Heb. 8:9), since they treat of other matters. The theory thus goes beyond Scripture and is a human speculation. We must, however, condemn Federalism for another reason (for which we condemn also many another Calvinistic speculation), namely, because it seeks to supply a rational ground for the (humanly speaking) grossly unjust divine act of the imputation. Federalism was meant to serve the cause of doctrinal apologetics.

In contradistinction to the Reformed divines the orthodox Lutheran teachers in general do not try rationally to explain the imputation of Adam's guilt and sin to his descendants but simply declare it to be a "stubborn fact," taught in Holy Scripture. To Lutherans it is sufficient that God's Word affirms this fact, even though human reason cannot comprehend the justice of it. This believing Lutheran "Scripture attitude" is brought to view very clearly in Dr. Pieper's *Christliche Dogmatik* (I, p. 645 ff.), where he treats the subject at sufficient length, without considering a single "*Imputationstheorie*." He first shows that the consequences of Adam's fall are the *culpa hereditaria* and the *corruptio hereditaria*. Because rebellious human reason objects mostly to the imputed guilt (as an act of injustice), Dr. Pieper emphatically points out both that God *does* impute that guilt (Rom. 5:12 ff.), and this despite all objections of men, and that God is and remains just while doing so. Lutheran theologians, following the clear testimony of Scripture, therefore accept both truths: 1. the imputed guilt, 2. the inviolate divine justice, without attempting a theodicy on this point. It is true, Dr. Pieper recognizes also the apologetic explanations which some Lutheran dogmaticians at times have attempted on this score (Quenstedt, p. 648; Meisner, p. 647); but he continues that the fact of the imputation belongs to the "stubborn facts" asserted by God's Word, to argue against which is vain, foolish, and vicious. He writes: "God always acts justly, even in such cases in which we cannot comprehend Him." Approvingly he quotes Baier (II, 290), who closes his admonition that it is not necessary for us to know *how* (*quomodo*) God could impute Adam's guilt and yet remain just, with the words: "It suffices that the *fact* is revealed, even if the *manner* is not explained." (*Sufficit enim tō ōti esse revelatum, etsi tō pōs ignoretur.*)

In the end, this believing "Scripture attitude" is the only reasonable one to take since not a single "theory of imputation" furnishes a really satisfactory apologetic for that divine act. Dr. Strong ultimately admits this when he writes: "We are to remember, however, that, while this theory [the Augustinian] of the method of our union with Adam is

merely a valuable [?] *hypothesis* [italics our own], the problem [rather, doctrine] which it seeks to explain is, in both its terms, presented to us both *by conscience* and *by Scripture* [italics our own]. In connection with this problem a central fact is announced in Scripture, which we feel compelled to believe *upon divine testimony* [italics our own], even though every attempted explanation should prove unsatisfactory. That central fact, which constitutes the substance of the Scripture doctrine of original sin, is simply this: that the sin [fall] of Adam is the immediate cause and ground of inborn depravity, guilt, and condemnation to the whole human race." (II, p. 625.) The truth here emphasized by Strong, namely, that all "theories of imputation" in the final analysis are only *hypotheses*, suggests an explanation of the fact that Dr. Pieper and most other Lutheran dogmaticians in their doctrinal treatises on this point do not argue the imputation on the basis of any "theory of imputation" but solely on that of Holy Scripture. *The short and long of it is that such theories do not get us anywhere.* The fact of the imputation of Adam's sin belongs, after all, to God's unsearchable judgments and His ways past finding out, Rom. 11:33.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

A Comforting Doctrine

It is a chain of four links that the apostle welds in treating the doctrine of predestination in Romans, chap. 8, v. 30: "Whom He did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified." The four links are: predestination, the call, the justification, glorification.

That He predestinated them means that He determined beforehand, even before the foundation of the world, to save those whom He chose for His own. These, then, He in time *calls* through the Gospel into the fellowship of His Son; and they heed His call. It was not that they were any better than others by nature, for all are equally lost in sin. Neither was their acceptance of the call their own work but the gracious work of the Spirit within them. And these that were called He *justified*, i.e., He forgave them their sins for Jesus' sake. And these who were justified He finally *glorified*—He brings them into the glory of heaven at last.

We may perhaps make this a little more clear by an illustration. There is a millionaire who decides upon a certain poor boy whom he is going to make his heir. That is predestination. Then he invites the boy to accept this, and the boy does accept it. That is the call. Next, he dresses the boy in nice clothing. That is justification—God dresses us in the garment of Jesus' righteousness. (And we might add to the illustration that the millionaire sends the boy to school in order to educate him for the life that is in store for him. So God deals with His children: He finds it necessary to send them tribulations, sufferings, and such like, as a schooling through which to conform them to the image of His Son.) And finally, the boy, having now attained to manhood, enters upon the full enjoyment of the inheritance. That is the glorification in heaven.

The first and the last link in the chain we do not see here in time, namely, the predestination and the glorification. But the two middle links are such that we may be aware of them. And the chain is unbroken. Therefore, if the two middle links are present, we have a right to conclude, and God would have us conclude, that the other two links are also present. For He has promised to continue the blessed work that He has begun in us. We shall comfort ourselves with our eternal predestination unto glory.

If the boy spoken of in the illustration should begin to wonder whether he really is to be the heir, how could he put his mind at rest? He should look at the invitation that was extended to him and at what the millionaire has already done for him; and he may say: "See, he is preparing me to become his heir, he has invited me, he has taken care of my needs, and he is training me for my future position. Therefore I must know assuredly that I shall once come into full enjoyment of the inheritance."

This doctrine of predestination is full of comfort to us Christians, especially if it happens to be a rigorous schooling through which the Lord is putting us. We may trustingly give ourselves wholly over into the arms of God's grace with the prayer: "Continue what Thou hast begun; take Thou my hand and lead me through the whole journey of my life; and I shall once praise Thee in glory above. 'For I am persuaded that neither death nor life nor angels nor principalities nor powers nor things present nor things to come nor height nor depth nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord.'" — A. M. H., in *Lutheran Sentinel*.

Appropriating Creation to the Father

From inquiries submitted on this point it appears that Question 106 in our Synodical Catechism is causing catechists no little trouble. A brother who was to present the matter to a pastoral conference writes among other things: "If the second part of the answer to Question 106 is Bible doctrine, why is no proof offered? Which are the proofs from Scripture? Scripture is full of statements ascribing creation to God, but have we sufficient proof to ascribe it to the *Father* as we ascribe redemption to the Son and sanctification to the Holy Ghost?" In another letter the request is expressed that the matter be briefly explained in one of our periodicals.

We understand that in the new, revised Catechism the question and the answer will be amended; but the matter is nevertheless important enough for us to consider it here in a few simple paragraphs. The question "How are these divine Persons distinguished from each other?" properly and primarily calls for the distinguishing divine internal works (*opera ad intra*), which indeed are correctly stated in the Catechism answer (first part, before the dash). No doubt this was considered to be the complete answer to the question, for not only was a dash placed after it, but also Scripture-proof was supplied only for the *opera ad intra*: generation and spiration. Unfortunately, however (perhaps as a sort of afterthought), also the *opera ad extra* or the divine

external works (*creation, redemption, sanctification*) were added, though they were separated from the *opera ad intra* by a dash. The addition cannot be condemned as fundamentally wrong, because, after all, the question as stated in the Catechism is broad enough to include both the *opera ad intra* and the *opera ad extra*, the former distinguishing the three Persons in a proper, the latter in a more general way. Scripture itself distinguishes the divine external works by appropriating creation to the Father, redemption to the Son, and sanctification to the Holy Ghost. Nevertheless the supplement is *confusing*, inasmuch as it obscures the fundamental distinction between the divine internal and the divine external works. To clarify the supplement, Scripture-proof should have been appended; for whatever is Christian doctrine must be proved to be such from God's Word.

The fact that in the divine internal works we have *real distinctions*, caused by their very nature, requires no further proof. Generation is the work of the Father, while spiration that of the Father and the Son, as the given Scripture-passages clearly show. However, in the divine external works (e.g., creation, sanctification, inspiration, etc.) we do not have real distinctions, since these are "concurrent acts of the three Persons in the Trinity." (Cf. A. L. Graebner, *Outlines of Doctrinal Theology*, § 53.) The so-called *opus mixtum* (Christ's redeeming work) is a doctrinal *unicum*, since the Son, while accomplishing it alone (Eph. 2:13; Col. 1:20; 1 John 1:7; etc.), was not without the Father and the Holy Ghost in performing it. In other words, Christ was sent and sustained by the Father (John 3:16; Matt. 26:38 ff.) and anointed with the Holy Ghost to accomplish His work (Ps. 45:7; Heb. 1:9; Acts 10:38). The fact of the *opus mixtum*, however, does not abrogate the rule that the divine external works are undivided (*Opera ad extra indivisa sunt*), the three Persons of the Trinity concurring in them. (Cf. *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 152 f.; 156 f.; *Christliche Dogmatik*, I, p. 514 ff.) Since the divine omnipotent action is numerically one (*una numero potentia*), it is the *totus Deus*, or the Triune God, who created the world, redeemed fallen mankind, and sanctifies the elect (Gen. 1:1, 2; 2 Cor. 5:18 ff.; 1 Pet. 1:3, 4; Jer. 31:18; Ps. 51:5; Ezek. 36:22 ff.; 2 Cor. 4:6; etc.). The clear and unmistakable Scripture doctrine therefore is: *Opera externa tribus personis communia sunt*. Just because there is only one God, we owe all that we are and have to this one God, in the realms both of nature and of grace. (*Creatio est actio Dei unitrini externa*.)

However, just as Scripture ascribes the *opera ad extra* to the one God, so also it *appropriates* them to the individual persons in the one undivided Godhead, as our Catechism in the appendix to Question 106 correctly states. This it does from the viewpoint of the *three Persons*, the distinction making for greater clearness and emphasis of both the divine persons and their works. Thus the Father is represented in a special sense as the *Creator* (First Article of the Creed). In Heb. 1:1, 2 Scripture, for example, tells us that God made the worlds by His Son. So also in Ps. 33:6, where it is said that the heavens were made by the Word (the "Personal Word," the *Logos*) of the Lord. In 1 Cor. 8:6 St. Paul writes that to Christians there is but one God, the *Father*, of

whom are all things. In a similar manner the Son is represented in a special sense as the Redeemer of fallen mankind (Second Article of the Creed). The passages in which redemption is ascribed to the Son are more numerous than those in which creation is ascribed to the Father and, besides, much clearer (John 1:14; 1 Tim. 2:5, 6; Gal. 3:13; 4:4, 5; etc.). Lastly, in a special sense the Holy Ghost in Scripture is said to be the Sanctifier (Third Article of the Creed). It is the Holy Spirit who reproves the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment (John 16:8), guides men into all truth (v.13), glorifies Christ (v.14), leads sinners to be God's sons (Rom. 8:14), bears witness that believers are God's children (v.16), and is Himself "the Spirit of adoption" (the Holy Spirit through whom our adoption as God's children is secured), through whom we cry, "Abba, Father" (v.15).

Nevertheless, while Scripture thus appropriates the divine external works to the three persons of the Holy Trinity in this individualizing way, it at the same time represents these works as being those of the *totus Deus*, and this in so absolute a manner that it ascribes creation in a special sense also to the Son (John 1:1 ff.; 1 Cor. 8:6: "*one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things*"), redemption to the Father and the Holy Ghost (2 Cor. 5:18 ff.; Is. 61:1, 2; etc., since the Redeemer was sent and sustained by the Father and was anointed and equipped for His office with the Holy Ghost), and sanctification to the Father and the Son (1 Thess. 2:12, 13; 2 Thess. 2:13-17; 1 Cor. 1:2, 28-30; etc.). The divine external works are thus ascribed to individual persons in the Holy Trinity as well as to the *totus Deus*, so that they appear in Scripture both as appropriated works (*opera appropriativa*) and joint works (*opera communia*). The explanation of this seemingly contradictory *modus loquendi* is to be found in the fact that the one true God (*una numero essentia*) is the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, so that the divine external operation (*una numero potentia*) can be ascribed either essentially to the Triune God or personally to individual persons in the Trinity. Dr. Pieper calls attention to the fact that this is not a distribution ("*Verteilung*") of the divine external works among the three Persons, as errorists have charged, but rather an attribution (*attributio*) or an appropriation (*appropriatio*), as the orthodox teachers of the Church have always expressed themselves. (Cf. *Christliche Dogmatik*, I, p. 514 f.)

Heinrich Schmid quotes Gerhard on this point as follows: "But that one true God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; therefore in Scripture the work of creation is ascribed to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost. Of the Father it is affirmed in 1 Cor. 8:6; of the Son in John 1:3; Col. 1:16; of the Holy Ghost in Job 26:13; 33:4; Ps. 104:30. We conclude therefore that creation is an undivided act of the one and true God alone, namely, of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." To this Dr. Schmid adds: "If nevertheless creation in a special sense is called the work *ad extra* of God the Father, this is done only by way of appropriation." Hollaz is quoted on the matter thus: "In Holy Scripture and the Apostles' Creed the work of creation is ascribed in a peculiar manner to God the Father: a) because of the order of working, since what the

Father has of Himself to do and to create the Son of God and the Holy Ghost have of the Father; b) because in the work of creation God the Father, by His most efficacious word of command, manifested His own omnipotence, Gen. 1:3; c) creation is the first divine work *ad extra* and therefore by appropriation is affirmed of the First Person of the Godhead." (Cf. *Doctrinal Theology*; tr. by Hay and Jacobs, p. 162.)

To the objection that by such appropriation of the divine external works to individual persons in the Trinity confusion may be caused among simple Christians we may reply that the difficulty involved in this matter is not a whit greater than that which inheres in the doctrine of the Trinity itself. As little as we can understand God's divine *being*, so little also can we understand His *works*. Luther therefore aptly suggests that, if the doctrine should be too difficult ("*scharf*") for simple Christians, they should adhere to their simple faith that God: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is one God. (Cf. *Christliche Dogmatik*, I:516; St. Louis Ed., III:1923.) Luther, however, adds that, since all doors are open to the devil to lead astray whom he desires, it is profitable and necessary that some, laymen no less than scholars, but especially pastors, preachers, and teachers, should learn to meditate and speak clearly ("*deutsch reden*") on such necessary articles of our faith. (*Christliche Dogmatik*, I:513; St. Louis Ed., III:1884 ff.) In his excellent exposition of 2 Sam. 23:1-7, in which Luther treats the doctrine of the Trinity at great length, he points out that, as Scripture ascribes certain works to individual persons in the Godhead, so also certain *illustrations*. The Holy Ghost, for example, is distinguished by the symbol of a *dove*, which is never applied to the Father or to the Son; the Father, by the *voice from heaven*; the Son, by the *form of a servant*. As Luther says, Scripture, speaking in these terms, means to impress upon us the real distinction between the three Persons in the Godhead, just as do the *opera ad intra* (generation and spiration), and, in a special sense, also the appropriated *opera ad extra*. (We cordially recommend for conference study Luther's excellent *Auslegung der letzten Worte Davids*, 2 Sam. 23:1-7; St. Louis Ed., III:1185 ff.)

Illustrations of the Holy Trinity taken from the realm of human life and experience are of course altogether inadequate; nevertheless, when we attribute to the one mind of man the threefold function of thinking, willing, and feeling and ascribe to the intellect the act of, let us say, memorizing, though in memorizing also willing and feeling come into play and thus the whole mind of man, we have a faint reflection of what it means to ascribe the act of creation personally to the Father (or to the Son or the Holy Ghost) or essentially to the *totus Deus*. Because the living God is the great One in Three, we can say: God created; God redeemed; God sanctifies; and: The Father created; the Son redeemed; the Holy Ghost sanctifies. Those who shrink from teaching such an appropriation of the divine works must in the end also shrink from teaching the very doctrine of the Holy Trinity itself, of which this is only a part.

We suggest, not that the matter be omitted from our Catechism, but that it be presented under a new question, at least in a Catechism which is intended for advanced Bible students. J. THEODORE MUELLER

Where Shall We Stand?

In the September, 1940, number of the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* Dr. John C. Mattes of Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa, publishes a sturdy essay having the heading "Where do We Stand?" The last section of it speaks of the future and is given the subheading "Where shall we stand?" Since what is stated there is always timely, we reprint this last section:

The Church is at the crossroads in her inner relationships. Shall we present a united front to the world? Shall she know of only one doctrine, and shall she preserve the integrity of the Word? There is no question about the answer here. Neither is there any question about the fact that unnecessary divisions are not only a sin against the unity of the Church of the Word but that they are also one way in which men make themselves guilty of the sins of obstructing the work of the Church.

Where does the guilt rest, and who is responsible? We answer all those who have lost the vision of the *Una Sancta* and who place any human relationship above their fidelity to the Word and its integrity. It rests on the shoulders of those who are encased in the sectarianism of the Pharisee and on the shoulders of those who are dissolved into the sectarianism of Liberalism. Practically the latter are the greatest offenders, and it is they who are the great obstructionists today. When men prefer the company of errorists to that of the faithful, they have lost their sense of the value of their birthright.

Here it is that we challenge all the Lutherans of America. Do you or do you not want to realize the unity of the Church and assure her a united front in the battle against the powers of darkness and error? If you believe in the Holy and Apostolic Church, then you pastors must be the leaders who hold themselves clear of all official associations with error in the field of religion and keep themselves free from all entangling alliances with worldly associations that teach religious errors. Unless that is the case, the finest professions are not worth the paper they are written on. Mark you this: the chief obstructionists are the so-called "liberals," and those who are doing the most to destroy the unity of the Church are the unionists. On such the guilt for the sin of division must lie.

We are standing at the crossroads! There is only one duty for the Church. If she is to be faithful to her mission, if she is to do the work of the Lord effectually, if she is to preserve the integrity of God's Word, if she is to guide the world on the right road, she must not be divided against herself, she dare not dissipate her energies, she must think and move and live as the *Una Sancta*. A.

An Interesting Reference to Luther on Galatians

In John Wesley's *Journal* we read: "William Holland tells how he went round to Charles Wesley's with Martin Luther's Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. 'I carried it round to Charles Wesley, who was sick at Mr. Bray's, as a very precious treasure that I had found, and we three sat down together, Mr. Charles Wesley reading the Preface

aloud. At the words "What, have we, then, nothing to do? No; nothing! but only accept Him who of God is made unto us Wisdom and Righteousness and Sanctification and Redemption," there came such a power over me as I cannot well describe; my great burden fell off in an instant; my heart was so filled with peace and love that I burst into tears. I almost thought I saw our Savior. My companions, seeing me so affected, fell on their knees and prayed. When I afterwards went into the street, I could scarcely feel the ground I trod upon." Is it surprising that on May 23, 1738, only two days after this experience, Charles Wesley should write this hymn?

Oh, how shall I the goodness tell,
Father, which Thou to me hast showed;
That I, a child of wrath and hell,
I should be called a child of God,
Should know, should feel, my sins forgiven,
Blest with the antepast of heaven.

The Riches of His Grace, by John Schmidt, p. 30

Abaddon — Apollyon

In Rev. 9:11 we find the peculiar term Ἀβαδδὼν, which is translated by another unusual term, at least as far as the New Testament is concerned. The passage reads: "Ἐχουσιν ἐπ' αὐτῶν βασιλέα τὸν ἄγγελον τῆς ἀβύσσου, ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἐβραϊστὶ Ἀβαδδὼν, καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ ὄνομα ἔχει Ἀπολλύων. The word Ἀβαδδὼν is a transliteration of the word אֲבַדְדֹן. The Greek word Ἀπολλύων is derived from the verb ἀπολλύω (ἀπόλλυμι). The fundamental meaning of both is "to destroy." The Hebrew word אֲבַדְדֹן is found in Job 26:6; 28:22; Ps. 88:12; Prov. 15:11. In each of these instances it is translated in the LXX by the Greek word ἀπώλεια, destruction. The Hebrew word אֲבַדְדֹן may be translated by "the place of destruction or the sphere of death." The Greek word used in the LXX, ἀπώλεια, may be translated destruction. In Revelation the angel of the abyss is called Ἀβαδδὼν or Ἀπολλύων. A weird comment on this word is found in one of the Coptic Apocrypha, in the "Book of the Resurrection of Christ," ascribed to Bartholomew, the Apostle, edited with English translation by E. A. Wallis Budge, M. A., Litt. D., Keeper of the Egyptian and Assyrian antiquities in the British Museum. We read there on pages 179—180 the following words:

"Now, when they crucified the Savior, they laid Him in a tomb, and He rose from the dead on the third day, and He carried the soul of the holy man Apa Anania with Him into heaven forthwith, and he ate and drank with our Savior at the table of His kingdom. And Joseph of Arimathea made ready for burial the body of the Son of God, and when large quantities of most precious scents and unguents had been poured out upon it, he laid it in a new sepulcher. Then death came into Amente,¹⁾ saying, 'Where is this soul which hath come forth from the body newly? It hath not been brought unto me to Amente. For,

1) Amente, the old Egyptian word "Amentet," which was originally the great Other World on the left bank of the Nile. Here, however, it includes the Other World of Palestine.

behold, I have sought for it for two days, but have not found it. What, then, is the meaning of this mighty and wonderful thing? I know not, neither do I know what is the meaning of this terrible disturbance which taketh place this day. The whole world and everything which is therein is in a state of violent commotion. Never before have I known anything like unto this.' And Death called his minister and said unto him, 'Let us go unto every place and see if we can find this newly dead body and this new soul which hath hidden itself; for I know not whither it hath departed.'

"Then Death came into the tomb of the Savior, and he found it lighted up with the light of life, and he went into the back of the tomb, and seated himself there with his ministers. Now Abbaton,²⁾ who is Death, and Gaios and Tryphon and Ophiath and Phthinon and Sotomis and Komphion, who are the six sons of Death, wriggled into the tomb of the Son of God on their faces in the form of serpents, wriggling in with their great thief in very truth. These robbers and evil-doers were lying in wait for the moment wherein the Savior would go down into Amente, so that they might enter with Him and know what it was that He would do. And the Savior made Himself manifest unto them in the form of a dead body, in the hinder part of the tomb; He was lying upon the ground in their midst,—now it was the second day that He was in the heart of the earth,—and there was a napkin bound round His face and another one bound round His head. Gaze thou thyself, O my son, at what His eye doth gaze at, how that the sun doth stand still and doth not rise upon the earth, for He hath covered His face with a napkin." Incidentally, does not this excerpt remind one of the inferiority of the Apocrypha, even when considered merely from the literary point of view?

K. G. M.

2) Abbaton, Hebrew: אַבְּטוֹן. Greek transliteration: 'Αβαδδών. Greek translation: 'Απολλύων.



Theological Observer — *Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches*

The Resolutions of the U. L. C. A. Pertaining to Lutheran Union.— We reprint here the recommendations made at Omaha last October by the U. L. C. A. Commission on Relationships to American Lutheran Church-bodies.

"1. We recommend that the United Lutheran Church in America, in convention assembled, approve the three Articles of Agreement with the American Lutheran Church submitted with this report, believing that, when similarly approved by that body, they will lead to full pulpit- and altar-fellowship between us.

"2. We recommend that the United Lutheran Church in America approve in principle the considerations set forth in the second section of this report, herewith recording its understanding that the three Articles of Agreement herewith submitted do not in any wise alter the fundamental positions of the United Lutheran Church in America and that they are not contrary to, or contradictory of, the positions set forth in the Washington Declaration of 1920, the Savannah Resolutions of 1934, or the Baltimore Declaration of 1938.

"3. We recommend that the United Lutheran Church in America continue its Commission on Relationships to American Lutheran Church-bodies with a view to the organic union of all our Lutheran forces in America, on the basis of our Lutheran Confessions alone."

The three Articles of Agreement referred to in these recommendations are the so-called Pittsburgh Agreement, dealing with lodge-membership, pulpit- and altar-fellowship, and the inspiration of the Scriptures. All three recommendations were adopted, although the first and the second did not receive unanimous approval. After the above action had been taken the following additional resolutions were adopted:

"WHEREAS, The agreements reached by the Commission on Relationships with American Lutheran Church-bodies and the similar commission of the American Lutheran Church have been approved by this convention; and

"WHEREAS, Said agreements involve statements on matters of practice and doctrine which, the commissioners of the American Lutheran Church have represented, were the only matters of difference between our two bodies and the only obstacles to the establishment of pulpit- and altar-fellowship between said bodies; and

"WHEREAS, The United Lutheran Church in America has not recognized heretofore, and does not recognize now, any obstacle to the establishment of pulpit- and altar-fellowship or even to organic union with the American Lutheran Church; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the United Lutheran Church in America, That it hereby declares itself ready to establish pulpit- and altar-fellowship with the American Lutheran Church and authorizes the President to declare such fellowship established upon the adoption by the American Lutheran Church of a resolution of like effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That the United Lutheran Church in America hereby reiterates its request to the American Lutheran Church to authorize its commission, or appoint another commission, to negotiate with our commission with a view to the organic union of our two church-bodies; and be it further

"Resolved, That the President be, and hereby is, instructed to bring these resolutions to the attention of the American Lutheran Church at the earliest possible moment, so that it may have them for consideration at its convention now in session in Detroit."

Dr. Reu (*Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, December, 1940) comments as follows:

"Auf diese letzten drei Beschlüsse bezog es sich — und nicht auf die drei Sätze des Pittsburgh Agreement, wie man aus dem Bericht des Lutheran (30. Okt., S. 21) schliessen musste — dem Pittsburgh Agreement stimmten Bagger, Krauss und Miller zu; sie waren ja Glieder der Pittsburgher Kommission; die Delegaten der Zentral-Pennsylvania-Synode dagegen werden zu denen gehört haben, welche gegen dies Agreement stimmten — wenn in der Schlussitzung am 16. Oktober drei Glieder der Pittsburgher Kommission: Dr. H. Bagger, Paul Krauss und Clarence Miller, und die 70 Delegaten der Zentral-Pennsylvania-Synode unter der Führung ihres Praesidenten Dr. M. R. Hamsher ihren Dissensus zu Protokoll gaben. Sie gaben ihn gesondert, weil sie offenbar aus ganz verschiedenen Gründen diesen letzten drei Beschlüssen nicht zustimmten."

After Dr. Reu has reported the action of his own synod, the American Lutheran Church, on relations to the U. L. C. A. and on future negotiations in general (see *CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY*, Dec. 1940), he submits these comments, which should be made known to our readers:

"Was sollen wir zu all diesem sagen? Wir freuen uns natuerlich von ganzem Herzen, dass die Vereinigte Lutherische Kirche die drei Sätze des Pittsburgh Agreement mit grosser Majoritaet angenommen hat, und erkennen darin auch wirklich einen Beweis dafuer, dass das konservative Element in dieser Kirche erstarkt ist, wofuer wir besonders Praesident Dr. Knubel zu danken haben. Aber die Wahrheit verlangt es auch, zu sagen, dass diese unsere Freude doch noch durch allerlei getruebt ist. Der erste Beschluss billigt wohl das Pittsburgh Agreement, fuehrt aber mit der Hinzufuegung des Partizipialsatzes "believing that [the adoption of the Agreement] will lead to full pulpit- and altar-fellowship between us" einen eigentuemlichen Grund fuer diese Billigung ein. Zur Annahme des Pittsburgh Agreement sollte nur eins fuehren, naemlich die Ueberzeugung, dass es mit der Schrift stimmt. Kirchenpolitische Gesichtspunkte sollten dabei entweder ueberhaupt nicht in Betracht kommen oder doch nur in ganz sekundaerer Weise. Hier ist es der einzige Grund, der erwaeht wird. Nun haben ganz gewiss viele fuer die Annahme der Sätze gestimmt, weil sie von ihrer Schriftgemaessheit ueberzeugt sind, aber genannt ist nur die Hoffnung auf die aus der Annahme resultierende Aufrichtung von Kanzel- und Altargemeinschaft.

"Auch der zweite Beschluss enthaelt Elemente, die einen stuetzig machen. Damit, dass er sagt: We 'approve in principle the consideration set forth in the second section of this report,' scheint er die Annahme

derselben doch stark einzuschraenken. Man wird aber noch mehr stutzig, wenn man die Fortsetzung des zweiten Beschlusses liest:

"Herewith recording its understanding that the three Articles of Agreement herewith submitted do not in any wise alter the fundamental positions of the United Lutheran Church in America and that they are not contrary to, or contradictory of, the positions set forth in the Washington Declaration of 1920, the Savannah Resolutions of 1934, or the Baltimore Declaration of 1938."

"Soll das heissen, dass das Pittsburgh Agreement nur eine durch die Verhaeltnisse wuensenswert gewordene weitere Ausfuehrung des im Konstitutionsparagraphen niedergelegten Bekenntnisstandpunktes ist und dass auch der im Pittsburgh Agreement enthaltene Satz ueber die Schrift zwar ueber die bekannte Baltimore Declaration von 1938 hinausgeht, aber doch nicht in Widerspruch zu ihr steht? So moechte es die Liebe auslegen, und wenn diese Auslegung richtig ist, wuerde der zweite Beschluss sein Befremden verlieren. Eines will bloss nicht recht dazu stimmen, naemlich der Umstand, dass die Baltimore Declaration gerade im Unterschied und Gegensatz zu der damals schon von uns vorgelegten Form 'ohne Irrtum und Widerspruch' angenommen wurde, waehrend man jetzt zu dem 'irrtumslos' sich bekennt. Ich kann sehr gut die Ruecksichten verstehen, die zur Vorlegung dieses zweiten Beschlusses gefuehrt haben, aber sie scheinen mir wieder auf kirchenpolitischem Gebiet zu liegen, und Ruecksichten solcher Art sollten in Dingen, von denen das Agreement handelt, nicht bestimmend wirken. Sie schaffen auch keine wirkliche Ueberzeugung, und nur feste Ueberzeugungen werden das auf diesem Gebiet nicht immer leichte praktische Handeln erzeugen und zum Beharren dabei fuehren. So, wie der zweite Beschluss lautet, klingt er als eine Einschraenkung des ersten, und der kuenftige Kirchenhistoriker, der einerseits das Handeln in Baltimore genau kennt und Einsicht in das Protokoll unserer letzten Sitzung in Pittsburgh nimmt, wird schwerlich anders urteilen koennen. Das Pittsburgh Agreement ist in seinen ersten zwei Saetzen allerdings nur Wiederaufnahme der entsprechenden Washingtoner Erklaerung, aber in seinem dritten Satz, der Ausfuehrung ueber die Schrift, geht es in dem Sinn ueber die Baltimore Declaration von 1938 hinaus, dass hier ausgesprochen wird, was auszusprechen man sich in Baltimore noch geweigert hat. Wie gut und notwendig war es unter diesen Verhaeltnissen, dass es von unserer eigenen Kirche in Detroit unmissverstaendlich ausgesprochen worden ist, in welchem Sinn und Umfang sie dem Pittsburgh Agreement zustimmt: 'with the definite conviction that this agreement is in complete harmony with our Declaration and the Brief Statement.'

"Am dritten Beschluss faellt auf, dass die Kommission der Vereinigten Lutherischen Kirche mit allen andern lutherischen Kirchenkoerpern 'with a view to organic union' verhandeln soll. Hier verfolgt man ein Ziel, das wenigstens vorderhand noch phantastisch und vielleicht fuer immer bedenklich ist. Jedenfalls hat unsere Kirche durch ihre Kommission von Anfang an erklaert, dass sie mindestens zur Zeit an keine organische Verbindung mit andern Kirchenkoerpern denkt, und die be-

schlossene, aber noch zu ernennende neue Kommission hat keine Autorität, in dieser Richtung zu handeln. Verstaendlich ist, dass als Basis fuer solche Unionsverhandlungen nichts anderes als die historischen Bekenntnisse der lutherischen Kirche dienen sollen. Es bleibt bloss die Frage, was damit gemeint ist. Soll das heissen: Der Umstand, dass ein lutherischer Kirchenkoerper nach seiner Konstitution auf den symbolischen Buechern unserer Kirche steht, ist ausreichende Grundlage, auf der man sich mit ihm organisch zusammenschliesst; oder soll damit eine gegenseitige Vergewisserung verbunden sein, dass die *doctrina publica* und das kirchliche Handeln der in Betracht kommenden Kirchenkoerper den Bekenntnisschriften unserer Kirche entspricht? In welcher Form diese Vergewisserung vor sich geht, ist von geringer Bedeutung, sie selber aber ist unerlaesslich. O wie wuerden wir uns gefreut haben, wenn die Omaha-Beschluesse nicht so bedenkliche Limitationen in sich zu tragen schienen; und wie wuerden wir Gott danken, wenn sie in der gesamten lutherischen Kirche unsers Landes — auch bei uns selber fehlt es vielfach — ohne Einschraenkung durchgefuehrt wuerden!" A.

The "Journal of Theology" Report on the Fifth Biennial Convention of the American Lutheran Conference. — As many of our readers know, the *Journal of Theology* is the official organ of the American Lutheran Conference. It is edited by a committee on which the various synods composing the American Lutheran Conference are represented. Its editor-in-chief at present is Dr. J. M. Bruce of the seminary of the Norwegian Lutheran Church at St. Paul, Minn. In the December number of the *Journal*, on three and one half pages, an account is given of the events at the meeting of the American Lutheran Conference held November 13—15 at Minneapolis, Minn. We submit some of the chief items.

The convention was opened with a divine service on Wednesday morning, November 13, in which the sermon was preached by Dr. E. E. Ryden, the president of the body. In the various devotional services, addresses on topics pertaining to doctrine or the religious life of the Church were delivered. The subjects discussed in these addresses were: "Open Doors for the Church in the World Today"; "Dangers to the Church in the World Today"; "The Hope of the Church in the World Today." At a fellowship banquet Dr. Conrad Bergendoff, president of the Augustana College and Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill., spoke on the topic "The Lutheran Church in Today's World." The officers of the American Lutheran Conference as elected at this convention are: President, Dr. E. E. Ryden, Rock Island, Ill.; First Vice-President, Rev. Alfred Wilkie, Minneapolis; Second Vice-President, Rev. Clarence J. Carlson, Minot, N. Dak.; Third Vice-President, Rev. Karl Wilhelmsen, Racine, Wis.; Secretary, Rev. L. M. Stavig, Northfield, Minn. Subjects discussed on the basis of committee reports were: "Church Unity"; "Student Service"; "Parish Education"; "Social Relations"; "Home Missions." Since the American Lutheran Conference has now been in existence for a decade, anniversary addresses were given by Dr. P. O. Bersell, president of the Augustana Synod, speaking on the subject "Ten Years of Fellowship in the American Lutheran Conference," and Dr. T. F. Gullixson, president of Lutheran Theological Seminary (Norwegian),

St. Paul, Minn., on the subject "The American Lutheran Conference in the Future."

An editorial in the same number of the *Journal* contains a few paragraphs which we here reprint because they are the nearest approach to a discussion of the difficulties confronting the Conference that we find in this issue. "From expressions heard in private conversation and in groups, it was evident that many had come to this convention with more or less pronounced misgivings as to the character, success, and results of the convention. We are confident, however, that no one left this meeting without a sense of gratefulness to God for the heartening fellowship enjoyed, the fine spirit that prevailed, and the significant accomplishments achieved. No one could leave the convention without the feeling that it had brought Lutherans of five independent church-bodies affiliated in the Conference to understand one another better, to experience an increased sense of unity of spirit and a recognition of the fact that a closer and warmer bond of fellowship had been established between them. The convention was in the best sense a love-feast, a cloud-remover, and a workshop. Whatever misgivings and doubts may have been entertained beforehand seemed to vanish like dew before the sun as the convention advanced from session to session. The voices of the few fearful members which voiced warnings and tabus, restraint and repression, were soon silenced, not by rebuke or censure, but by the very spirit that prevailed and gradually placed its spell over all. Even the voice of a rather officious and superior-minded church official, who rolls out his words with ponderous accents on every syllable, even when uttering the most puerile thoughts, and pours contempt and scorn on the opinions and work of others, tapered off materially from session to session as the impact of the real convention spirit made itself felt with increased power and effect.

"One clerical representative came to us and confided that he had prayed much for this convention, saying that he had prayed God to give the Scandinavians and the Germans sense enough to part company, for they were not of the same spirit. We assured him that God would not hear such prayers, and we are confident that the last day of the convention especially vindicated our assertion. We need not close our eyes to racial differences or to differences in traditional, cultural, and religious backgrounds, for knowledge and recognition of these should enable us to evaluate one another more correctly and deal with one another more intelligently and sympathetically; but we need to emphasize the barrier-destroying, unifying, equalizing, and harmonizing power of the Spirit of God more, so that the oneness in Christ, the communion of saints, which we confess, may become more apparent and effective in our mutual relations."

It will be noticed that this report, like the one we submitted last month, makes no mention of any earnest endeavor to come to grips with the questions pertaining to doctrine and practice which agitate the Church at present. We cannot understand the course which is being followed. How can true unity be established if there is no discussion of great pending issues?

A.

What Constitutes Unionism? — Under this heading the *Australasian Theological Review* (July-September, 1940) which just reached our desk contains a brief but exceedingly lucid and informing "help toward the solution of the very real, very perplexing, and very painful difficulties" arising in connection with the problem of unionism, by the able pen of Prof. Henry Hamann. Defining unionism (syncretism) as the "*establishment or practice of religious fellowship where there exists no true union based on doctrinal and confessional unity*," the essayist first states five "fundamental Scripture axioms" that must be considered at this point, namely: 1. Only Scripture is the source and norm of all teaching in the Church; 2. the Church must be a confessing body, declaring all truth of God and Christ and rejecting, and bearing witness against, all error; 3. no one has the right to teach otherwise in the Church than God's Word teaches; 4. persistent false teaching, continued against all protests, instruction, and admonition, must at last lead to separation, either through the withdrawal of the orthodox from the heterodox or through the exclusion of the heterodox from the orthodox Church, where toleration of the error, in the sense of bearing with the weakness of some members, is no more possible; 5. such separation excludes or precludes church-fellowship on the part of the two factions now represented, that is to say, the mutual recognition by word and (or) deed as Christian brethren and members of one spiritual family. Judging according to these principles, Professor Hamann next tabulates "what is always and necessarily unionism," namely: 1. church union without doctrinal and confessional unity; 2. pulpit-fellowship, or the exchange of pulpits, on the part of those differing in doctrine and confession, though not every filling of a heterodox pulpit by an orthodox preacher is unionistic; 3. altar-fellowship, that is, "open," or "mixed," Communion, since Holy Communion is justly regarded as a symbol of unity (1 Cor. 10:16, 17); 4. union services, united services, combined services, of every kind, participation by pastor or congregation in such services; 5. united prayer on the part of officials or representatives of various churches; 6. the support of heterodox churches and missions and of union endeavors which are evidently of a religious nature; 7. remaining in heterodox bodies and in communion with them in spite of better knowledge. "All these and similar instances constitute unionism, since they represent a public and official exercise of church-fellowship or religious fellowship."

The writer, however, readily admits that sometimes there is room for doubt even if there is public or even official connection with heterodox or unionistic bodies. Here the principle obtains: "*Not the external presence, contact, or connection but the unwarranted fellowship is to be avoided.*" The canon applies: "*Whatever clearly violates our duty to confess the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth of the divine Word, and hence also violates the corresponding duty to denounce and reject every error opposed to that truth; whatever compromises or contradicts our confession of the truth and, on the other hand, invalidates, nullifies, renders of no effect, our protest against error; whatever assigns to error equal place and equal right with truth; whatever clearly creates the impression of church-fellowship, of full agreement*"

and harmony, where these do not exist,—all this is plainly unionism, indifferentism, syncretism." (Italics ours.) So also in the case of "unionism in the private conduct of Christians": "There can be no question of unionism where the presumption of unwarranted church-fellowship or religious fellowship, or the presumption of the toleration of error, cannot in reason and in fairness arise." (Italics original.) "If, thus, I am in some one's house (some one's not in communion with me) or he is a guest in my house, I cannot see the least justification to excuse myself at that stage or to show by an attitude of studied indifference or non-attention that I dissociate myself from the proceedings." "The parties are meeting not as members of differing church-bodies but as relatives or friends, or their relation is for the present merely that of host and guest, and usually the matter of church-fellowship, of confession and doctrine, does not at all arise." If against this, the charge of "fellowship in prayer" is raised, such fellowship is "merely external," for here no "establishment of religious fellowship is contemplated or insinuated or indicated or consummated, and no such purpose can even be presumed."

"Of course, in the circumstances spoken of, situations may arise that would require us to act differently. If I have reason to suspect that my host or my guest considers my conduct as equivocal or that he thinks I am dealing with him on a basis of real fellowship instead of merely accepting a situation from which I cannot in decency escape, then it is my duty to disabuse his mind of this mistake. Or suppose that my host and I had been discussing questions of doctrine and after tea he were to say to me: 'After all, these doctrines are of little consequence; let us show that we still acknowledge each other as good Christians and brothers in the common faith by uniting in reading the Scriptures and in offering prayer,' at once the circumstances would be materially altered. I should find myself *in statu confessionis*, and it would be my duty to say, 'Quod non!'"

In the concluding paragraph (the article is by far too long to be quoted extensively) Professor Hamann writes: "I believe that there are, and always will be, situations where the decision as to whether unionistic practice is involved is both difficult and doubtful, with the consequence that there may be a difference of opinion among orthodox Lutheran theologians; for we are now dealing with a *practical question*, involving the application (italics original) of certain Scripture-truths to new surroundings and to a great number of changing and shifting circumstances. It follows that various incidents which may from time to time have to be examined for unionistic implications belong to the field of casuistry and that something will often have to be left to the individual conscience." (Italics ours.) "This is not to say that uniformity of practice is not desirable and should not be aimed at."

Professor Hamann's essay on unionism is valuable not only because it clearly defines the *essence* of unionism, but also because it shows that the *fact* or *occurrence* of unionism must not be judged in a mechanical or external manner, as if a mere accidental juxtaposition of orthodoxy and heterodoxy constituted this offense, and again, that on this point we are dealing with a *practical question*, involving the application of

Scripture-truths to new surroundings, so that "something will often have to be left to the individual conscience." Professor Hamann thus combines in splendid harmony the full rigor which God's Word demands on this point with that charity which we owe a brother or sister under given difficult circumstances, always remembering, however, that uniformity of practice is highly desirable and should always be aimed at, for which reason the question should have our constant prayerful study. His detailed description of unionism (given above in italics) is, we believe, classic both as regards substance and form. J. T. M.

Vagueness in Doctrinal Statements.—The following appeared in the *Theological Forum* (Norwegian Lutheran Church) in 1934 (October issue p. 187). Our readers will understand why we call attention to it at the present time.

"One of the grave dangers that are threatening the Christian Church today is that many who profess to be its members no longer accept the Bible as God's inspired Word. Even among Lutherans strange sounds are sometimes heard regarding this subject. There are some Lutheran theologians who find it rather difficult to declare unequivocally their exact position on the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of the Bible. To some of these it seems an unpleasant task to make their position clear, and often the distinction in sounds is such that it is impossible to say what has been piped or harped (1 Cor. 14:17).'" E.

Is the Pope the Antichrist?—The *Journal* of the American Lutheran Conference, December, 1940, says on page 875: "The early reformers believed the Pope to be the Antichrist. Now, we know that the Pope may have belonged to the antichristian system, but he was not the final Antichrist. Two reasons suffice. First, the evil Popes have come and gone, and the world still goes on. Secondly, the Popes admitted there was a God, and the final Antichrist will not admit any God besides himself. The final Antichrist will be atheistic in spirit. It may be that the final Antichrist will be a Pope who will go farther than any of his predecessors and will claim divinity for himself.

"Communism of today fits this description of the final Antichrist better than does the pre-Reformation Papacy. But we are not safe in saying definitely that this prophecy is fulfilled in its entirety today. We cannot tell. We shall not know until the Son of Man Himself descends from heaven with a shout. The final Antichrist may arise from the line of prelates in Rome, a more iniquitous figure than any Reformation Age Pope. It may be that he will arise out of Communism or out of Fascism. Had the end come in Luther's time, Christ would undoubtedly have considered the Pope as sitting in the temple of God, as the Antichrist. Had Christ come during the eighteenth century, He would have found the spirit of Antichrist in the likes of Voltaire and the Encyclopedists. If Christ comes today, Communism with its opposition to Christianity and to all religion except the worship of Lenin would be the Antichrist. But Christ may postpone His return, and in latter times a more literal fulfilment of the prophecy may be apparent."

One statement in the above is correct, that of the opening sentence. The "early reformers" certainly taught that "the Pope is the very Antichrist." (Smalc. Art., II, Art. IV, § 10.) E.

Orphaned Missions. — This is a term used to designate those missions in foreign countries which are cut off from their home base. It refers particularly to German and Scandinavian Lutheran missions, which on account of the war can no longer receive supplies from the home Church. That the men and women who carry on the work of these missions are facing or even enduring dreadful sufferings is not surprising. In our Synod moneys are being gathered to help these people in their physical distress. In Lutheran circles outside of the Synodical Conference an agency has been organized called Lutheran World Action. It represents the bodies sponsoring the Lutheran World Convention, and its aim is to assist orphaned missions. Mr. Paul E. Empie, assistant director of the Lutheran World Action, in the *News Bulletin of the National Lutheran Council*, has published information on conditions in the orphaned missions which we herewith submit to our readers. Mr. Empie writes:

"Lutherans in America who are joining together in their efforts to rescue orphaned Lutheran missions are mindful of the dire circumstances existing in these missions and ask us continually with deep concern, 'What are the conditions over there at the present time?' We cannot always answer to their satisfaction. Letters are infrequent, and authentic information is rare. This is a case where the old adage 'No news is good news' does not apply. We know that ordinary channels of communication have been cut off, that special channels are expensive and uncertain. We think nothing of writing a letter to a friend but should not forget the instance told us during the Emergency Appeal of the missionary in China who had to use his last few pounds of rice in order to purchase an air-mail stamp. Few of us have ever had to count pennies like that!

"Two letters from the mission-fields arriving in New York about the beginning of December provide illustrations of the present circumstances. One coming from Canton, China, and signed by a missionary says in part: 'I beg to apologize for not having written to you earlier to express my hearty thanks for the kind assistance which you rendered for the work of the Berlin missionaries in China. . . . May I assure you that without your help we would not have been able to continue our work. Your kind attitude brought us new hope and made us sure of the fellowship of the Christian communion, which cannot be destroyed. . . . Some time it seemed to us rather hopeless to carry on, as we even had not the minimum to meet our expenses for living, not to say of what the work required. . . . The Chinese people suffer unutterably; starvation is quite common and help insufficient.'

"The other letter came from the Danish mission at Beirut in Syria, a portion of which was written in late August. The following are extracts from a very lengthy description of the work and conditions: 'You will no doubt be wondering why you do not receive more word from Syria, but perhaps you realized before this that the ordinary mail routes have been interrupted ever since May. Now and then we receive a letter by air mail, but for the most part we are in the dark about what is going on in America. I fear the same may be true of you in reference to us. . . . We were greatly cheered [in receiving a letter] about the aim of the Lutheran Church to secure \$20,000 for the year for Syria.

You have no idea how happy this word made the Danish missionaries when we had the privilege of passing it on to them.

"We have received no support from Denmark since the early spring of this year. . . . The medical work has been continued all through the summer by keeping the out-patient department open and taking in the most urgent cases. At the end of the summer vacation the hospital will open normally, and we hope to open all our schools as well. This is made possible only by the willingness of the Syrian mission-workers to begin the new year without any promise of salaries. . . . We hope and pray that God will make it possible for us to continue mission-work here. No other Protestant mission is working here in these parts.

"Bird's Nest is the name of a lovely home by the seashore of Djaubeil, Lebanon. There the Danish Women's Missionary Board has been caring for Armenian children from the most miserable and starving families.' (Here a description is given of the school classes, infirmary and internal routine of this fine institution. — Ed.)

"In April this year we suddenly found ourselves cut off from any communication with our native country and our Missionary Board. Later we received word through the International Red Cross that it was impossible for them to send us help of any kind; so we had to face the sad task of cutting down the work and perhaps closing the home altogether. . . . We know that every child we are sending out will go back again to misery and suffering of many kinds. . . . Most of the children are sick and undernourished when they come, unable to play and laugh; but many of them soon grow healthy and beautiful; it is a joy to see them develop. . . . It has been a very hard task to decide which of our 260 children should be sent out. Again and again each child's case was examined, and about 120 of the oldest were sent to relatives. The family conditions of the rest were such that we could not bear to send them out; we decided to keep them as long as we had something for them to eat. Most of those who were sent out are now in great distress; many of them are again sick and hungry and live mostly in the streets because the street is better than the small, airless hole which is supposed to be their home. They beg us to take them back, and we have already taken some because we could not bear to see their dark, begging eyes filled with tears while clinging to us, . . . and constant prayer "Oh, please take me back!" is constantly ringing in our ears.

"It is not uncommon that children drop from the school-bench fainting from hunger. Many of them get only a piece of bread in the morning and stay over in school, having the same and maybe a tiny bit of cheese or a few olives.

"I would like my readers to see for themselves the Armenian refugee camp, with all its huts made up of old rubbish. Each family has only one small room, which serves as bedroom, kitchen, and all. No bedstead is found; all sleep on the floor. Rats and mice are frequent guests. Insects are innumerable and intolerable. The water is scarce in the summer-time, but in the winter-time the camp is a pool of mud and dirt. But in spite of misery and poverty the Armenians are doing their best to survive and progress.'"

It is impossible to read messages like the above without being deeply touched. Whatever we can do to alleviate such misery we should not hesitate to undertake. It is true, of course, that we must not assist in the spreading of error; but where there is actual physical suffering, we cannot withhold our help. A.

The Situation in Japan and Korea.—On account of the attitude of the Japanese government Christian missions in Japan and Korea are in great distress. One burden laid upon them is government action which demands that the disunion of Protestant churches cease and that there be one Protestant Church—an action obedience to which, it seems, must involve indifference to confessional teachings.

The *Presbyterian of the South* (quoted in the *Presbyterian*) made this statement: "To anticipate government action, forty Japanese representatives of various Protestant churches met in Tokyo on August 27, to discuss amalgamation of the different denominations, the cessation of financial help from abroad, the elimination of foreign missionaries, and Japanese missionary work in Manchukuo and China. It was agreed that establishment of the Genuine Japanese Christian Church should be announced on October 17, at the 2,600th anniversary of the traditional date of the founding of the Japanese Empire by the sun goddess. When it was proposed that the existing churches disband, the proceedings became deadlocked, and discussion was adjourned until a later meeting. Most speakers favored immediate dissolution to clear the ground for a united Japanese Church."

After reading the above, one will understand the following item which appeared in the *National Lutheran Council Bulletin*: "Under the new law religious groups, to be recognized, must have at least fifty congregations and 5,000 members. In order to comply in every respect, delegates to the recent biennial convention of the United Lutheran Church voted to combine U. L. C. congregations in Japan with those of the Lutheran Gospel Association of Finland. The new organization is called Nippon Sukuin, which means 'the denomination of the Japan Evangelical Lutheran Church.' This union creates a body of 13 ordained missionaries, 25 women missionaries, 60 Japanese pastors, 56 congregations, and 7,400 members. To retain proper contact with their home countries, the United States and Finland, the missionary organizations will remain separate, but the Church will function as one united whole."

In addition comes this news contained in correspondence from Japan published in the *Christian Century*: "Every home-bound ship carries missionaries of American, British, Canadian, and Australian citizenship away from their accustomed posts in Japan, Korea, Formosa, and occupied China. By far the largest missionary exodus to date is that occurring from Korea. Mere physical hardship daunts neither native nor foreign workers, but obligatory compromise of the Church's objectives and the feeling that the presence of Western Christians may bring additional suffering upon the Koreans have finally compelled the missionaries of the Methodist Church to withdraw in a body from Korea. The Presbyterians (Northern and Southern) are not acting in such a corporate way, but many are leaving. Doubtless the importunity of

the American consul in Seoul has also had much to do with these evacuations, but the fundamental reason may be seen in the recently issued plan for revision of Christian organizations and creeds in Korea to make them acceptable to the Japanese government. All with whom the writer has talked agree that no Christian missionary could remain and work in Korea under such conditions."

In the mean time efforts are being made to unite all Protestant Christians in Japan in one church-body. The correspondent whom we just quoted writes:

"The All-Japan Church of Christ (Protestant) is now from the government's viewpoint a reality, or practically so. At the Christian mass-meeting held at Aoyama Gakuin on October 17 in celebration of the 2,600th anniversary of the empire's founding, fully 20,000 were in attendance, representing almost all Protestant denominations in Japan, Korea, and other regions of Japanese occupation in the Far East. The following is a portion of the proclamation unanimously adopted on that occasion: 'Faced with a changing world, our nation has established a new structure and is pushing forward in building a new order in Greater Eastern Asia. We Christians in instant response, casting aside church and denominational differences and through church union and united effort, join in the great task of giving spiritual leadership to the people in respectfully and loyally assisting the throne in government and in rendering service to the nation.' This implies, and was followed specifically by, a pledge to 'the achievement of the union of all denominations in one Church.'

"According to the *National Christian Council Bulletin* for October, the following denominations have approved full participation in the union and appointed representatives to the commission entrusted with its organizations, statement of creed, and harmonization of procedure: Nihon Kirisuto (Presbyterian-Reformed), Methodist, Baptist, Evangelical Lutheran, United Brethren, Evangelical, Congregational, Society of Friends, two branches of the Holiness, Free Methodist, Christian Alliance, Disciples of Christ, Church of Jesus Christ, Nazarene, Tokyo Christ Church, Federated Church, Evangelistic Bands of the World, and a few other smaller groups. Contrary to earlier reports, the Greek Orthodox Church has not agreed to affiliate, and the Seikokwai (Anglican-Episcopal) is sending only observers to the commission. The Seventh-day Adventists are of course non-participant. Bishop Y. Abe (Methodist) has been elected chairman and Rev. M. Tomita (Presbyterian) vice-chairman of the actualization commission. It is hoped to have the union in a form acceptable to the civil authorities by the time the constitutions of all religious bodies expecting government recognition must be approved, viz., April 1, 1941."

Does this mean that convictions are violated, consciences are oppressed, and religious tyranny begins to appear? Whether the union of Protestant churches here described consists in more than cooperation in mere externals will have to be seen. The Christians in Japan need our most fervent prayers.

A.

Semper Eadem — Always the Same. — Recommending Dr. C. B. Gohdes's recently published book *Does the Modern Papacy Require a New Valuation?* the *Lutheran Herald* (Dec. 17, 1940) offers as "Exhibit I" in proof that the Roman Church is "still the same" an excerpt from an article published in the *Catholic World*, aggressive organ of the Paulist Fathers. In the September issue of this "Monthly Magazine of General Literature and Science" appears an article entitled "Peace on Earth." Of this article the *Lutheran Herald* quotes the first two paragraphs, which read as follows: "With the exception of the fall of man, the human race has suffered no disaster comparable to that of the Protestant revolt. These two disasters resemble each other more closely than is generally realized. Both were initiated by an act of disobedience having its roots in pride. Both were followed by consequences of an appalling nature, material as well as spiritual. The revolt of Adam was an offense against God; that of Luther, an offense against Christ. The former was a sin against creation; the latter, a sin against the redemption. Adam's disobedience separated men from the friendship of God and cast them out of Paradise; Luther's rebellion separated men from the friendship of Christ and cast them out of the Church." The editorial adds to this: "The substance of the article is a plea for a definite program seeking 'the reunion of Christendom in the Church of Christ,' i. e., in the Roman Catholic Church." And at the close: "In publishing these facts and opinions in the *Lutheran Herald*, there is no intention of stirring up hatred against the Roman Catholic Church. Our interest is simply to call attention to facts which have been recently forgotten or disregarded and which cannot be dismissed with impunity. For Rome is *semper eadem* — always the same."

In view of the "facts which have been recently forgotten or disregarded," it may be well for us once more carefully to study the reasons which led our Lutheran fathers to believe that the Pope is the Antichrist. They are given in detail in our Augsburg Confession, its Apology, and the Smalcald Articles, and they are just as convincing today as they were four hundred years ago, when thinking men did not close their eyes so as not to notice the facts. From the *Reader's Digest* (September, 1940), which quotes *Current History and Forum*, the *Lutheran Herald* offers the opening paragraph, which says: "In 1939 there were more converts to Catholicism than ever before in America. They numbered 73,677 — one third of the Church's membership gain for the year." "Yet Rome's arrogant assumption," continues the *Lutheran Herald*, "that she is Christianity and that outside her temporal organization there is no salvation, is not what makes her the serious menace many are again coming to realize her to be. Far more serious it is that we are again being forcibly reminded that the Roman Catholic Church claims temporal sovereignty not only over her own subjects, making them citizens of a temporal state situated in Europe, but over all men." The one error interests us as Christians; the other must claim our attention as citizens of a free democracy. Of the two the former is, of course, the more serious, though commonly this is not realized.

J. T. M.

Aus der Mission. Ende September v. J. wurde folgender Überblick über die Lage auf den Missionsfeldern, sofern besonders deutsche Missionare in Betracht kommen, in der „Allgemeinen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirchenzeitung“ unterbreitet. Wir drucken den Bericht ohne Kommentar ab.

„Die Mission der Brüdergemeinde hat trotz des Krieges Berichte von ihren Missionsfeldern in Südafrika, Mittelamerika und Alaska erhalten, so daß sie einen bebilderten Jahresbericht herausgeben konnte, der u. a. auch wertvolle Ausführungen zur Rassenfrage in Südafrika enthält. (Verlag der Missionsbuchhandlung, Herrnhut; 52 S.; Preis: 40 Rpf.) — Aus Ostafrika hat keine deutsche evangelische Mission seit der Mitteilung über die Deportierung der Deutschen nach Südafrika mehr eine Nachricht von dort erhalten. Nur der dänische Missionar Hansen von Unhamtvesi (Mission der Brüdergemeinde) konnte berichten, daß er die Gemeinden am Nyassasee besucht und bei den Gemeinden viel Verständnis für die Notwendigkeit enger Zusammenarbeit der Kirchenältesten und Prediger gefunden hat. — Aus einem Telegramm an die Basler Missionsleitung aus Buea geht hervor, daß die deutschen Missionare in Kamerun (vermutlich Männer, Frauen und Schwestern) interniert worden sind, ausgenommen eine krank gewordene Schwester, ein älterer Missionar und ein junger auf der Goldküste geborner Missionar. — Aus Holländisch-Westindien erhielt die Brüdergemeinde die Nachricht, daß alle deutschen Männer, auch die Missionare, zunächst von den Holländern nahe bei der Stadt Paramaribo, und (wohl nach der Besetzung durch die Engländer) auch die Frauen interniert wurden. Die Männer wurden nach Copieweg bei Paramaribo, die Frauen in ein altes Krankenhaus einer Zuckerplantage Marienburg an der Commewijne gebracht. — In Britisch-Indien liegt die Leitung der Arbeit der Gognerschen Mission in Chota Nagpur weiter in den Händen von Präses Stosch, der noch immer Bewegungsfreiheit hat, ebenso wie Missionar Radzid für Assam. Zwei Schwestern erhielten die Erlaubnis zur Rückkehr von Ranchi auf ihre eigenen Stationen, während die andern in Ranchi verbleiben mußten. — In Neu Guinea wurde der Leiter der Neuendettelsauer Missionsarbeit, W. Flierl, mit vier andern Missionaren in das camp in Australien gebracht, wo sich schon 18 andere Mitarbeiter befinden. Von 27 Missionaren stehen noch 10 in der Arbeit, von den 11 Laienmissionaren noch 3. — Alle Missionare in Niederländisch-Indien, auch die Ärzte, sind interniert, vermutlich auf Sumatra; die Frauen, wahrscheinlich auch die Schwestern, sind in Radja an der Ostküste gemeinsam untergebracht. Auch die Missionare von Nias sind wahrscheinlich in Sumatra interniert. — In der evangelischen Kamelmission in Palästina sind noch drei deutsche Schwestern tätig; ein Missionsgepaar, eine Missionarsfrau mit Kindern und zwei Schwestern sind evakuiert und befinden sich in der deutschen Kolonie Waldheim in Galiläa. — In Fran, wo die ausländischen Missionschulen dem Staat übergeben werden mußten, blieb die Blindenanstalt in den Händen der christlichen Blindenmission. — Missionar Martin von der Basler Mission, der in England interniert war, sollte Ende Juni auf der *Arandora Star* nach Canada gebracht werden. Das Schiff ging in der Irischen See unter; der Missionar wurde gerettet. Es wird angenommen, daß die andern Basler Missionare, Hägele, Jenne und Weber, die in England interniert waren, auch nach Canada verbracht worden sind.“

Book Review — Literatur

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

The Bible Book by Book for Students. By Rev. Wm. Stuart. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 115 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. Paper cover. Price: 60 cts.

The author presents a brief outline of every book in the Bible. The book, while exhibiting the Reformed doctrine (e. g., "Lord's Supper symbolizes and means salvation," etc., p. 15), will prove helpful in studying and analyzing the individual books. We do not agree with the author that the Song of Solomon "is a song of the love of marriage in Eastern language and imagery. The persons are Solomon and Shulamith and the daughters of Jerusalem." "The idea of the love of husband and wife sets forth the love between Jehovah and His people." (P. 48.) The Song is an allegory describing the mutual love of the Lord and the Church. Neither does Solomon in Ecclesiastes "write from the point of view of the irreligious man, who does not take God nor the life to come into consideration" (p. 47). What the author evidently means to say is that some of the passages are written from this viewpoint and the arguments of the ungodly answered by Solomon, who stresses the need of fearing and trusting the Creator and Judge of all mankind.

TH. LAETSCH

The Glory of the Manger. By S. M. Zwemer, D. D. 232 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7$. Price, \$1.50.

Who Is This King of Glory? By W. H. Johnson, D. D. 217 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7$. Price, \$1.50.

The Riches of His Grace. By John Schmidt, B. D. 247 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7$. Price, \$1.50.

The American Tract Society, 21 W. 46th St., New York, requested, in a Prize Book Contest, popular treatises on the essential evangelical doctrines and out of the 116 manuscripts submitted selected 13 for publication, among them our three books, Dr. Zwemer's book receiving first prize.

These three books display the great wealth the Church enjoys and is offering the world. They are worth reading. And what makes them particularly worth while is the great wealth of Scripture-proof with which they operate. This is the *glory of the manger*: The Son of God became man, born of the Virgin Mary, in order to gain salvation for us through His birth and His death ("Do not separate the glory of the Manger from the glory of the Cross," page 183). And He gained salvation for all of us, for all men. Dr. Zwemer, until recently professor at Princeton Theological Seminary, emphatically states: "In His incarnation Christ did not identify Himself with a part of the human race or with elect members of that race but with the whole family of humanity. . . . All are lost in sin, and He came to seek and to save the lost." (Pp. 157, 162.) For all men there is immense wealth in Christ. On the last page

Pascal is quoted: "Jesus Christ is the center of everything and the object of everything, and he who does not know Him knows nothing of the order of the world and nothing of himself. In Him is all our felicity and virtue, our life, our light, our hope; apart from Him there is nothing but vice, misery, darkness, despair, and we see only obscurity and confusion in the nature of God and in our own."

Who Is This King of Glory? His is the glory of God become man, the glory of the vicarious sacrifice, the glory of ruling a holy people ("Christian ethics finds its center in Jesus, the Son of God, and in His death upon the cross," p. 204), and His "the glory of the Captain of salvation bringing many sons to glory" (last page). There are those who cannot see this glory because they will not see their sin; they believe in "a god without wrath who drew men without sin into a kingdom without judgment by the ministrations of a Christ without a cross." (P. 186.) They want no Savior, but our boast is: "Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ; Thou art the everlasting Son of the Father."

And now for *"the Riches of His Grace"*! What the God-man gained for the sinners through His vicarious life and death He distributes with the lavish hand of grace. Study the meaning of this word, grace. In thirteen chapters (Two Religions, The Nature of Grace, The Enemies of Grace, Grace in the Old Testament, Grace in Jesus Christ, Grace in St. Paul, Grace Elsewhere in the New Testament, The Effectiveness of Grace, the Rejection of Grace, The Ethical Power of Grace, The Gifts of Grace, The Means of Grace, The Outreach of Grace) Pastor J. Schmidt of the Lutheran church of Blacksburg, Va. (now professor in Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary, Columbia, S.C.), describes the nature, the workings, and the glory of it. "Every non-Christian religion says, 'Something in my hand I bring,' while only Christianity says, 'Nothing in my hand I bring, simply to Thy Cross I cling.'" (P. 11.) "Could any illustration impress upon our minds the fact that salvation is wholly of God more than the Lord's word to Nicodemus 'Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God'? (John 3:3.) For never are we so completely dependent as at birth. Nothing that we have, not even life itself, is due to ourselves. We do not bring God down, nor do we climb up to Him. God comes seeking — John 3:16. . . . To claim merit in oneself is at the same time to reject the absolute grace of God." (P. 92 f.) The natural man hates nothing so much as the concept of grace. "Others reject the Gospel because it reflects upon the worth of man. . . . Pride is the great enemy of grace." (P. 149.) "The natural man is a born enemy of Christianity. . . . The natural man is a born Roman Catholic" (p. 30) and likes the creed of Will Durant, which "redefines" the Christian faith "as sincere acceptance of the moral ideas of Christ." (P. 70.) But those that know their poverty shall find immense wealth. "The Gospel of God's free grace is an all-sufficient gift. Its riches are beyond computation. This book and all others that may be written can only reveal a little of the hem of His garment. . . . Grace comes to each individual with the particular things he needs and desires. It is the grace of the unsearchable riches of Christ that we are permitted to share with all men.—1 Pet. 3:10, 11." (Concluding paragraphs.) "Thus

the Gospel of grace triumphs. It meets every need of the human heart, if only the Church has the faith and courage to employ this apparently inadequate and absurd weapon." (P. 147.)

What makes these books particularly valuable is the wealth of Scripture material they offer. Chapters 4—7 of *The Riches of His Grace* are exclusively exegetical, and "exegetical" in the sense that they simply present and emphasize the simple statements of Scripture. The other two books follow the same principle. They are content with the Scripture proof. And they are lavish with it. These writers know that you cannot give too much of it. It does not weary the Christian. And the simpler the language and argument, the better the Christian likes it. Take this section in *The Glory of the Manger*, page 172 f.: "The scriptural evidence . . . can be summarized because first of all, the *names*, *attributes*, *peculiar works*, and the *worship* due to the Creator are also ascribed to Christ. 1. *Names*. God," etc. 6 Scripture statements. "2. He is called the *Son of God* in a peculiar sense and as eternally begotten." 3 passages. "3. He is called *Lord* in more than fifty New Testament passages." Two are listed. "4. He performs the *works* of God. In creating," etc. 11 passages. "5. Christ possesses the *attributes* of God, eternity," etc. 10 passages. "6. Christ receives the *worship* of men and angels." 7 passages. That is the method employed in the old-fashioned catechism instruction, *Christenlehre*, and *Katechismuspredigten*. Here is a prominent theologian who does not disdain to employ it in a theological treatise. Let us not delude ourselves with the idea that the times call for a better mode of presentation.

We are sorry to say that in these books some dross is mixed with the gold. We cannot understand why Dr. Zwemer should believe in the deity of Jesus simply because Scripture teaches it and yet deny, on page 25, the instantaneous Creation, even though Scripture plainly teaches it. And one is still more surprised when he supports his denial by appealing to the Ninetieth Psalm and quoting that with Him a thousand years are as one day and one day as a thousand years.—Other cases of bad exegesis: 1 Tim. 2:15 is quoted as indicating the Virgin Birth: "She shall be saved *by the Child-bearing*." (P. 48.) "In these words ('If He called them gods,' John 10:35) Christ asserts the essential divinity of man by his origin and destiny." (P. 171.)—"Socrates is one of the five great historic figures raised up of God as harbingers of a new era and, in a sense, preparatory leaders for the coming of the King of Righteousness. He prepared the way for Plato and Paul." The others are Alexander the Great, Judas Maccabeus, Julius Caesar, Herod the Great. (P. 27 f.)—The Gospel is preached to the dead, in Hades. (P. 201.)—Whether one teaches premillennialism or postmillennialism or a-millennialism, "matters comparatively little." (P. 218.) (We can easily forgive the lapsus in the statement that "in 1854 Pope Leo (instead of Pius IX) set his seal on the doctrine of her [Mary's] immaculate conception.")—Dr. Johnson ascribes too much to Christian experience: "The ground of full assurance is found in the sphere of religious experience." (P. 18. See also p. 144.)—"The Sabbath is the oldest and most sacred of human institutions." (P. 24.)—The five reasons given on pages 156 ff.

for the credibility of the gospels (the first being "the strong and practically uniform tradition in the early Church that they were written by the apostles") carry great weight, but one is surprised that the chief reason is not mentioned—their inspiration. (Dr. Johnson believes in their inspiration.) — The claims of the radical critics are disallowed. But a concession is made to the literary critics with reference to "the apparently abrupt ending of Mark 16 at v. 8." (Pp. 28, 55.) — The thesis of *The Riches of His Grace* being: salvation is wholly by grace, we do not see how the author can make the statement: "We determine what kind of soil we shall be when the seed of the Word comes to us." (P. 153.) — The statement on page 64: "Essentially there is not so much difference between Luther and Calvin on the question of predestination as their followers, in times of controversy, have thought" must be greatly modified. — "Repentance is but the turning from our sin, and God desires us to turn to Him in glad trust." (P. 135.) That is a wrong definition of repentance. — The chapter on "The Means of Grace" is very weak. It lacks the Lutheran emphasis. The review of our book appearing in the *Lutheran* of August 7, 1940, too, says: "The reviewer regrets that more prominence has not been given to the discussion of the means of grace." — Like Zwemer, Schmidt teaches a Hades salvation. "The eternal fate of those who have never been confronted by an effective choice for or against Christ is another matter entirely, concerning which we can conclude only that God, who judges all men in accordance with their opportunities, will judge them also in love." (P. 155.)

Cast aside such dross in studying these three books. Appropriate the great wealth they offer.

TH. ENGELDER

The Vicarious Atonement through Christ. By Prof. L. Berkhof. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. 184 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$1.50.

The Manual of Reformed Doctrine. Same author; same publishers. 372 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$1.50.

Summary of Christian Dogmatics. Same author; same publishers. 197 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price: cloth, 60 cts.; paper, 40 cts.

Professor Berkhof of Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, Mich., is perhaps the outstanding orthodox Reformed dogmatician today. He follows closely in the footsteps of Hodge and Warfield, representing the strict Calvinistic trend in America. His style is direct and simple, yet vivid and dignified, and his works possess the charm of one who speaks with sincerity and conviction. His *Vicarious Atonement through Christ* is a historically valuable monograph, offering rich historicodogmatical material in a condensed and readily intelligible form. Interesting for the Lutheran student is the chapter on the "Objections to the Doctrine of a Limited Atonement," in which he shows why he holds to a "restricted design of the atonement." He bases his denial of the *gratia universalis* on what he believes to be convincing Scripture-proof, but no interpretation denying universal grace does justice to the passages which so clearly teach this doctrine.

Professor Berkhof's *Manual of Reformed Doctrine* is an abridgment of his *Reformed Dogmatics* (3 volumes) and is intended for high-school and college classes as also for instruction of older catechumens. In the preface the author writes: "I have tried to give a rather comprehensive and yet concise statement of the Reformed conception of the truth," to which the reader must agree as he studies the book, since nowhere the presentation is superficial. The arrangement of dogmatical heads follows that of the author's *Dogmatics*: Introduction; Doctrine of God and Creation; Doctrine of Man in Relation to God; Doctrine of the Person and Work of Christ; Doctrine of the Application of the Work of Redemption; Doctrine of the Church and the Means of Grace; Doctrine of the Last Things. The *Manual* offers a wealth of dogmatical material in a popular, yet scholarly presentation and presupposes on the part of the student great willingness to study the Christian doctrine thoroughly. The lucid, synoptic arrangement of the subject-matter makes the study of the book a pleasant task, though in its confutation of Lutheranism it at times does not adequately represent the Lutheran doctrine (e. g., baptismal regeneration, p. 239).

Berkhof's *Summary of Christian Doctrine* is an abridgment of the *Manual*, designed for less advanced classes; but also the *Summary* makes the study of the Christian doctrine no child's play. The arrangement of the subject-matter is very much like that in the *Manual*, but here only absolute essentials are offered, while exhaustive lists of Scripture-passages are printed out for memory work, with "questions for further study" and "questions for review." For formal study both the *Manual* and the *Summary* may be recommended to our pastors.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

Living Religions and a World Faith. By William Ernest Hocking. New York. Macmillan Company. 291 pages, 5¼×8.

This book is a glaring—and a terrifying—example of the lengths to which man's foolishness will go when it sets aside the eternal verities of the one inspired Book and its revelation concerning the way of salvation. The author, going way beyond the ordinary variety of unionism, here advocates a syncretism which would have shocked even the most rabid exponents of such practices a few decades ago. The philosophy which guides the discussion of the book may be seen from sentences like the following: "God is in His world, but Buddha, Jesus, Mohammed, are in their little private closets, and we shall thank them, but never return to them. Such is the spirit of world citizenship at this moment." (P. 22.) That the author is acquainted with the claim of Christianity as to absolute authority is apparent from his chapter on "The Way of Radical Displacement." (P. 143 ff.) But he condemns and spurns this way as being unsound, inadequate, and, to a large degree, doomed to failure. And so he proposes a synthesis, one far more daring than that offered by Hume, a synthesis whose criteria are individuality, organic unity, and consistency. And then he has the temerity to state: "I believe that we shall see in the Orient the rise of a Christianity [?] far outpassing that which we of the West have conceived." (P. 187.) He believes, and he states it in bold-face: "Christianity is not yet

ready to serve as a world religion." (P. 249 ff.) To this he adds another thesis: "Our present Christianity does not include all that other religions have." (P. 254 ff.) Suffice it to say that the religion which the author proposes as his final solution has nothing whatever in common with that which Jesus taught and for whose proclamation St. Paul gave decades of his life, finally sealing his faith with his martyrdom. We are committed one hundred per cent. to the Christianity of Christ crucified and resurrected.

P. E. KRETZMANN

Selections from Hellenistic Philosophy. By Gordon H. Clark, Wheaton College. F. S. Crofts & Co., New York. 1940. 267 pages, $4\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$. Price, \$1.25.

An elegantly bound, attractive little volume. Are its contents important? As everybody knows, Hellenistic philosophy is not studied nearly as much as that of the classical period in Greek literature. Who would think of spending as much time on Seneca or Marcus Aurelius as on Plato or Aristotle? The general opinion is that in Hellenistic philosophy (dating from about 300 B. C. to 500 A. D.) one deals with what is senile, or decadent; hence the authors representing it are usually merely mentioned, not read. But Dr. Clark undoubtedly is right when he advocates that we take a different attitude. He very properly points out that to assume that during so many centuries Greek philosophy was characterized by nothing but decay is unreasonable. He reminds us, too, that during this period there came the religion of Jesus Christ, through whose influence the heathen schools of philosophy were gradually closed. In addition, he tells us on the opening pages that the view that Hellenistic philosophy concerns itself with nothing but ethics is erroneous, and he mentions several instances of solid contributions to science during this period. We, too, should like to see the study of Hellenistic philosophy receive more attention in our theological circles. It seems to us that Christian theologians might profitably delve into this material more than is commonly done. After all, it is the philosophy of the age when our Savior dwelt visibly among men and the apostles planted the Church and gave us our inspired New Testament. We cannot understand this age too well. To read the writings that were produced at this time, to study the inscriptions and the papyri that come from this period, to acquaint oneself with the thought patterns dominating the thinking and the literary expressions of that day, equips us for a fuller understanding of the language of the New Testament and the views of the people for whom it was intended. The book consists of a preface and six chapters (Epicureanism, the Stoics, Plutarch, Philo Judaeus, Hermes Trismegistus, Plotinus). The work is intended as a volume that can be used in teaching Hellenistic philosophy. Every chapter includes a discussion of the topic and contains quotations from the most important sources. It is, then, a work offering source-material. Naturally, the selections submitted are given in an English translation. The author has carefully checked the translations and here and there adds a critical or otherwise enlightening note. Since works on the philosophy of Plutarch and of Philo as well as selections from the Hermes Trismegistus

literature are comparatively rare, we have here a welcome addition to present-day philosophical and semitheological literature. The learning and the carefulness of the author deserve high commendation.

W. ARNDT

Seven Religious Isms. By Herbert M. Wyrick. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Price, 50 cts.

We announce this book because of its chapter on Anglo-Israelism. The author devotes about fifteen pages to this ism, whose basic theory is that the English race constitutes the lost ten tribes of Israel.

F. E. MAYER

The Oxford Book of Christian Verse. Chosen and edited by Lord David Cecil. Oxford at the Clarendon Press. 560 pages. Indexed. Price, \$3.00.

This is the latest volume in the Oxford University Press poetry series, which includes the *Oxford Book of Carols*; the *Oxford Book of English Verse* (1250—1918); *Poems*, by Robert Bridges, and others. The editor and compiler has selected the poems in this anthology with the view of presenting such only as "are consistent with the doctrines of orthodox Christianity." He has deliberately confined himself to poets born in the British Isles, with the exception of the American Thomas Stearns Eliot, founder of the modern school of English poets.

In an introduction of twenty-two pages Lord Cecil gives a very readable survey of the Christian poets of England and rightly says that a collection of English Christian verse is "both a history of Christianity in England and an exhibition of the varieties of the religious temperament." His selections range from the pre-Reformation stage to the present day. He describes our age as an age of doubt, especially among poets, not many of whom write about religion.

He includes selections from the writings of 130 poets. Quite naturally, we find among them many of the great names from the field of English hymnody, although the book is in no sense an anthology of hymns.

For all those who love poetry the volume will be of great interest and permanent value, as many of the poems are not readily available otherwise. Pastors will find many quotable lines and stanzas for use in their sermons and addresses. One or two short selections will be sufficient to illustrate. Here is Robert Herrick's "Grace for Children":

What God gives and what we take,
'Tis a gift for Christ His sake:
Be the meal of beans and peas,
God be thanked for those and these.
Have we flesh, or have we fish,
All are fragments from His dish.
He His Church save and the king,
And our peace here, like a spring,
Make it ever flourishing.

Here is "Before the Beginning" by Christina Georgina Rossetti:

Before the beginning Thou hast foreknown the end,
Before the birthday the death-bed was seen of Thee:
Cleanse what I cannot cleanse, mend what I cannot mend;
O Lord All-Merciful, be merciful to me.
While the end is drawing near, I know not mine end;
Birth I recall not; my death I cannot foresee:
O God, arise to defend, arise to befriend;
O Lord All-Merciful, be merciful to me.

And in the modern manner, these lines from Thomas Stearns Eliot's "From 'the Rock'":

There shall always be the Church and the world,
And the heart of man
Shivering and fluttering between them, choosing and chosen,
Valiant, ignoble, dark, and full of light,
Swinging between hell gate and heaven gate;
And the gates of hell shall not prevail.

W. G. POLACK

Proceedings of the Sixty-Third Convention of the Central District, assembled at Fort Wayne, Ind., June 17—21, 1940. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 93 pages, 6×9. Price, 29 cts.

Besides an essay on "The Importance of Prayer in the Life of a Christian," by Rev. J. W. Acker, given in condensed form, this report offers a paper on "The Scriptural Position with Reference to the Responsibility of the Church toward Welfare Works," read by Prof. E. E. Foelber, one of the most satisfactory presentations of this much-discussed subject that has come to our attention. We urge our pastors to invest the small sum required for the purchase of this report. The report of the District Mission Board was submitted in a rather novel manner, in the form of an imaginary interview between an interested and interesting layman and the Director of Missions, Committee No. 14 (Recommendations on Mission Work) coming in at opportune moments with their recommendations to the convention.

TH. LAETSCH

Lutheran Annual 1941. Literary Editor: Dr. J. T. Mueller. Statistical Editor: Rev. S. Michael. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 196 pages. Price, 15 cts.

Amerikanischer Kalender fuer deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1941. Literarischer Redakteur: Dr. J. T. Mueller. Statistischer Redakteur: P. S. Michael. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 196 pages. Price, 15 cts.

Our old *Annual* and *Kalender* appear again in the old, accustomed form, color, and contents. The number of pages is larger than ever and the information offered on these pages really remarkable. There should be no need of urging the sale of these necessary vademecums of every member of the Synodical Conference synods. The usual calendar material and factual and statistical material on all these synods fill all but 27 pages of the sizable book; on the latter is offered a very brief biography of our departed President, Dr. F. Pfotenhauer, and a great number of little stories and clippings of educational or devotional character.

THEO. HOYER

BOOKS RECEIVED

From Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:

Concordia Collection of Sacred Choruses and Anthems for More Ambitious Choral Organizations. No. 56: "The Lord Is My Light." Mixed Voices and baritone solo. By J. C. Wohlfeil. 6 pages. Price, 25 cts.

From the Bible Institute Colportage Assn., Chicago:

By-Paths in the Bible Country. By Charles A. S. Dwight, Ph. D. 128 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$1.00.

S

'
A
. .
f
t
e
. .
l
t
f
,
-
-

•
•
•
•
•
•
•
•
•
•
•